

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
JULY, 1894.

ARTICLE I.

"DR. REMENSNYDER'S LUTHERAN MANUAL."—A REJOINDER.

By J. B. REMENSNYDER, D. D.

The writer needs make no explanation for any of his literary work. His record is before the Church. In whatever activity he has displayed, he has known but one motive, disinterested desire to serve the great Evangelical Lutheran Church. His love for his ecclesiastical mother, especially as from out the mists of his early Puritanical training and prejudice, her ideal gradually arose before him in all its perfection, has amounted to a passion. Her welfare has lain near his heart. Her obstacles, and embarrassments, and hindrances, have excited his deep concern. Her grand providential mission has quickened his enthusiasm. And whatever, as a loyal son, he could do to heal her divisions, to correct misrepresentations, and to accord to her that place at the head of the evangelical Christian host, which rightly belongs to her, he has done. This is the sole explanation of every line he has written, and of whatever movement in which he may have been enlisted. That in this effort criticism should have to be encountered and obloquy endured is no new thing for a Christian in the service of the Church catholic, and, as history abun-

dantly shows, no new thing for a Lutheran to experience in the service of his particular church.

Precisely the same motive accounts for the origin of the "*Lutheran Manual*." Nearly twenty years ago "Heavenward" was written, because at that time no book of devotion, from a Lutheran standpoint, applicable to the needs of catechumens, was in the hands of pastors. That it was not illly adapted to that want is shown by the fact that it has been, in continuous editions, circulating through the Church ever since. But a more emphatic need has been an epitome, in popular form, of Lutheran doctrines, history, institutions, worship and usages, for our laity at large, so as to give them an intelligent idea of the distinctive glories and claims of the Church of their choice. This is especially necessary here in America, where the other Churches are possessed of so many other advantages and influences, enabling them to build up largely out of our Lutheran material, and to grow strong through our losses. Yet, while in the book-stores of other denominations such "Manuals" will be numerously found, and while students and colporteurs are circulating them in every home, and making the most illiterate layman often a skilful advocate of his Church, no work precisely of this character exists among us. Hence, although a pastor, borne down with work, the author undertook to render what he deemed an imperative service to his Church. That the book is far from perfect he very well knows, and knew before it ever issued in print, as his distressed publishers, seeking to shut out belated corrections, can attest. And that criticism should be made of it, that it could not suit every one, and that manifest lapses and defects should be pointed out, was only what was naturally to be expected. If one cannot bear this, he ought not to enter the lists of authorship. And if such liability to imperfection were to interdict book-writing, there would be an end to literature.

But in this instance the author cannot but congratulate himself upon his work's reception. The general favor accorded to the "*Manual*" has been so great as to be a surprise. The unanimity with which it has been endorsed, and the rapidity of its

circulation, have been perhaps without precedent. This endorsement has come from such antipodal quarters as the General Synod and the Synodical Conference, and from such widely removed witnesses as the heads of theological seminaries, and laymen in the secular walks of life.* So noticeable has been this feature of its reception that a leading journal of the General Synod in a late issue thus editorially comments :

"Dr. Remensnyder has made quite a hit with his 'Lutheran Manual.' He has won the endorsement of the press in every branch of the Church, including the principal papers of the General Synod, General Council, Joint Synod of Ohio, United Synod of the South and the English Missouri Synod. In addition to this, the circular just published presents a consensus of approval from representative men in the different bodies—the president and an ex-president of the General Synod, an ex-president of the United Synod, an ex-president of the General Council, professors at Gettysburg, Wittenberg, Midland, Columbus and Mt. Airy. 'Missouri' is not represented among the latter, Professor Pieper's appreciative notice having appeared since the publication of the circular. A man who can write a book that commands, along with some minor criticisms, the endorsement of the entire Lutheran Church, deserves—well, that itself is honor enough for any mortal."

These prefatory remarks are justified by the striking exception we are to notice. In the last number of the QUARTERLY Dr. Valentine has an article with the caption : "Dr. Remensnyder's Lutheran Manual," which not only takes objection to it, but denounces it in unmeasured terms. In fact, so utterly does it lack the judicial temper that it is not a criticism, but a Philippic.† "Amusing surprises," "slip-shod sentences," "all sense overboard,"

*Dr. Valentine says: "The proceedings of at least *one* [italics ours] Synod indicate an easy readiness to accept it and hasten its recognition as worthy of being adopted as a standard authority." In the circular from which he presumably derived this information, *six* synods, five of them belonging to the General Synod are cited as having taken action endorsing it and commanding its circulation.

†"It is a very suspicious symptom of a deficiency of the popular element in a book, when it calls forth no harsh criticism."—*Nathanael Hawthorne.*

"sort of reasoning that finds place in this so-called manual," "most vicious method," "chaos of ideas," "surprising and misleading representations," "bungling and misleading," "dangerous to evangelical piety," are types of the wholesale denunciations which burden almost every page. No moderation of the Christian spirit, no amenity of scholarship, and no canon of social courtesy restrains the temper, or curbs the vehemence of the language characterizing this attack. We cannot help but think that even those who sympathize with Dr. Valentine's attitude will regret the tone of this invective. And while what seems to us the coarse and disrespectful severity of this article, will naturally demand vigorous response, we trust that no provocation may ensnare us into similar error. For this there is no occasion. For happily we speak to an audience who will not mistake assumption for wisdom, or consider derogatory epithets as the tests of scholarship.

But several reflections naturally arise here. One: What must we think of the intelligence of the Lutheran Church in America to accord such a consensus of approval to so "slip-shod," "chaotic," and "vicious" an exposition of her faith. Another: Why does the critic trouble himself to make such a close study of, and to hurl such a lengthy attack upon, so weak and self-destructive a production? Assuredly the most fitting fate that could overtake it would be to let it die in ignominious peace and quiet. But the irate tone of this critique betrays in fact the very opposite. Indifference and disdain reveal their artificiality where such studied care is taken to give them elaborate expression. And so this malevolent style is incited by a bitter sense of the success with which the Manual is doing its work. It is at once a confession and a lament. It is an hysterical attempt to withstand the strong and rising tide of approval everywhere greeting the "Manual."

Again, we observe here the isolation of the reviewer. In his Philippic he stands practically alone. Every other head of a Lutheran Theological Seminary warmly commends the Manual. Says Dr. Ort of Wittenberg Seminary, (Gen. Synod): "The Lutheran Manual is an admirable popular presentation of the

doctrines of our Church. It is the thing long needed. No effort should be spared to circulate it among the laity." Dr. Jacobs, Theol. Seminary Phila.,(Gen. Council) writes: "It is a clear, sober, solid, well-guarded and comprehensive presentation of the history, doctrine, worship and government of the Lutheran Church. It is the product of the most recent discussions within our Church in this country, every chapter showing how thoroughly posted the author has been in all that is transpiring in its various sections, and how well assimilated have been the results reached. The wide circulation of this book will, in every way deepen the love for the Lutheran Church, and aid in the more intelligent discharge of duties that are due her." Dr. Loy, President of Theol. Seminary of Joint Synod of Ohio, says: "The whole spirit and tenor of it is such that I wish for it a wide circulation." And even Prof. Pieper of the Concordia Theol. Seminary (Synodical Conference) departs from the wonted "Missouri" reserve, and in a lengthy review marked by courtesy and candor, pronounces this favorable opinion: "The author's inspiration for the Lutheran Church appears so clearly throughout this book, that every Lutheran reader is favorably impressed with it. * * We acknowledge having read the Manual with great interest and many parts of it with great joy." When, then, these presentations elicit such hearty commendation from these widely diverse Lutheran quarters, but excite only aversion, bitterness and indignation on the part of one critic, is not the inference painfully inevitable that it is not the Manual but the critic that is "so variously at fault" as to "the doctrinal teachings of the Lutheran Church?" And is this not a significant illustration of the fact that the censor occupies a *solitary* position; that he is not in touch with the dominant spirit of the Church; but that he has fallen behind and out of line in the movement of our whole American Church toward historic Evangelical Lutheranism?

Another fact, illustrating this same point, and none the less consolatory to the author, is that Dr. Valentine, in repeated attacks, at still greater length, and in perhaps not less severe terms, assailed the work of the distinguished committee who prepared

the explanations of Luther's Catechism ordered by the General Synod. Yet despite all these charges, continued to the latest hour, the General Synod, with practical unanimity, directed it to be published "for use in the churches."

As a further instance of this isolation may be given his attitude respecting the term "trespasses" in the Lord's Prayer. He is the only Lutheran known who advocates "debts" for this expressive and beautiful word, in antagonism to every publication every issued by the American Lutheran Church.*

Dr. Valentine begins his critique by specifying a "slip-shod" sentence, and a verbal inaccuracy. The correction of this particular verbal error, "etymologically" for "historically," with a score of others, has, at this writing, been in the hands of the publishers for three months. The stereotype plates are now undergoing careful revision for the issue of the third edition, and any blemishes of this sort which any critic may kindly bring to the author's notice, or which he may himself discover, will be removed. But assuredly these are utterly inadequate grounds upon which to base serious charges against the character of a work. Such defects are of trivial import. The only contest here which is at all worthy of the issue, ought to turn upon the large characteristics and general merits of the work, upon those points that are of some vital consequence.

The next ground of attack is based on the opening clause of the chapter on the sacraments. "Sacrament is the Latin form of the New Testament Greek word, *μυστεριον*, whence comes our English word Mystery. The sacraments consequently are the sacred mysteries of Christianity—the holiest ordinances of our religion." These words Dr. Valentine assails with extreme severity as a "spurious handling of New Testament terms—a handling in blank obliviousness and disregard of actual facts." What I have asserted, is not that the New Testament applies the term *μυστεριον* to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but that "sacrament" is the Latin

*Since writing the above an editorial has appeared in the *Evangelist* strongly endorsing Dr. V.'s view of the "Manual." It appears, then, that there is one exception to his complete isolation. He has the company of the latest champions of the Definite Platform.

form of the New Testament Greek word *μυστεριον*, whence comes our English word mystery." And the inference I wish to be drawn is that, if the learned Christian fathers by common consent considered that sacrament,—the synonym of this New Testament word,—was the term best fitted to characterize these two ordinances, it showed how preëminently they looked upon them as "mysteries." And do not the facts amply sustain this? The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia on the term sacrament says: "Sacrament is not strictly speaking a scriptural term, but occurs repeatedly in the Latin Vulgate as a translation of the Greek, *μυστεριον*, mystery (Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 9, 32; 1 Tim. 3:16; Rev. 1:20). It came into technical ecclesiastical use with Tertullian at the close of the second century, and the beginning of the third. It was first loosely employed for all sacred doctrines and ceremonies, like the Greek *μυστεριον*, and then more particularly for Baptism and the Eucharist.* Quenstedt says: "The word sacrament is understood in a *very general sense*, for any hidden or secret thing. Thus, the incarnation of Christ, the union of Christ and the Church, etc., are called *μυστερια*, which the old Latin interpreter translated *sacramenta*. It [the word sacrament] is understood in a *very particular sense*, for the solemn rite instituted, prescribed, and commanded by God, in which, by an external and visible sign, invisible benefits are graciously offered, conferred and sealed." Certainly, then, there is no disputing my affirmation that the manner in which the English term sacrament came into use was from the original use of *μυστεριον* in the Greek New Testament, and its rendering by *sacramentum* in the Latin Vulgate. And the reason why I cited this scriptural origin and descent of the term was, not at all to teach that it was applied in the Scriptures specifically to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but to show that the historical and ecclesiastical significance of the appellative was "mystery." And beyond doubt the early and general application of this term to distinguish Baptism and the Lord's Supper shows conclusively what the mind of the Church was with respect to them from the be-

*Vol. III, p. 2093.

ginning. And this fact tends to strengthen the Lutheran view that they are not to be explained and understood in a natural way after Reformed processes, but that they have an incomprehensible side, and are to be received in faith as holy mysteries.

"The Catholic wishes to *see* the union of the divine and human; the Lutheran wishes to *believe* it; the Reformed, wishes to *understand* it," writes a great Lutheran. "That in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper I was more Reformed than Lutheran, will be supposed as a matter of course," said Bahrdt, the father of modern Rationalism. And why? Because Lutheranism held so firmly to the *mysterious* and supernatural character of Christianity. This feature especially comes to view in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is a vital distinction between the Lutheran and the Reformed view of looking at the sacraments, and one that can be easily grasped by the common mind, and that commends itself very strongly to the earnest believer. Hence the propriety of bringing it out pointedly in a popular treatise. Of course where there is only a vague conception of its value, and where there is indifference as to emphasizing the distinctive features of our Church, desire to give prominence to it will not please but offend.

Dr. Valentine also does me great injustice here by only quoting me partially. I say: "The Sacraments consequently are the sacred mysteries of Christianity—*the holiest ordinances* of our religion." This last explanatory clause he omits altogether, and yet it is essential to the sense. There are many "mysteries" in the Christian religion, as the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Trinal Mystery, &c. But these are purely *doctrinal* mysteries. The peculiarity of the Sacraments is that they are *ordinances*, and that here the mystery assumes an especial character because connected with something natural, visible, and tangible. Consequently as *ordinances*, as institutions, as outward marks of the Church, the Holy Sacraments in a very peculiar sense are entitled to the appellative given them in the Manual, "*the sacred mysteries of Christianity*." And does not Christian experience likewise justify this position? Who does not feel, especially as he approaches the altar to participate in the Lord's

Supper, that he is entering the inner temple, the *arcانum* of things divine, the Christian Holy of Holies, and that reverence and awe become him as at no other place and time?

"The Lutheran Manual's" application of several Scripture texts comes in for the next censure. Especially severe is the criticism of the use of the passage: "This treasure we have in earthen vessels," 2 Cor. 4:7, to illustrate the conveyance of a divine gift through the outward agent in the sacrament. The Manual does not teach for a moment that the sacraments were directly had in view by the apostle. But it assumes that this passage lays down a generic law of the relation between spirit and nature in the economy of the kingdom of God, which affords a parallel to the communication of grace through a natural medium in the Eucharist. Does Dr. Valentine mean to say that in the application of the spiritual sense of a Scripture text we are held down inexorably to the particular and individual instance for which it is employed by the sacred writers? A very narrow sphere would then indeed be open to the religious teacher. But Holy Scripture reveals generic moral laws and principles, as well as lays down particular precepts, and he whose mind is opened by the Spirit of God will see much further than the mechanical letter, and will "behold wondrous things out of thy law." (Ps. 119:18). Very much in our application of Scripture depends upon our point of view. And the writer believes that he who pursues his Scripture studies with a prepossession in favor of Lutherizing views, will find many passages illustrating and supporting that great distinctive theory of Lutheran theology, that a fundamental characteristic of the divine order of salvation is the mediation of the kingdom of spirit through the kingdom of nature. And he will perhaps find no more striking illustration of it than in this noble and far-reaching passage: "This treasure we have in earthen vessels." One coming with a different prepossession will no doubt fail to find this significance, but even he, restrained by the "sweet reasonableness" of the Christian spirit, might not go so far as to charac-

terize the opposite inference as a "flagrant example of a most vicious method of quoting the divine oracles."

Quite as unnecessary and remarkable is the objection to another textual application on p. 46 of the Manual, as follows: "This baptismal grace is not conveyed magically, but only in accordance with the scriptural conditions. It can, too, be lost, and assuredly will, unless "that good thing which was committed unto thee," thou "keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us," (2 Tim. 1 : 14). This is called an "unedifying" attempt to prove from the Scriptures "that baptismal grace may be lost." The context shows that there is not the slightest pretence to so employ it. It is introduced merely as a scriptural charge that God's spiritual gifts to us,—one of which is baptismal grace,—we shall not carelessly neglect, but zealously guard by the indwelling Holy Spirit. Surely it is unworthy the grave issues that confront us as guides of souls to have to spend time on such cavils as these.

Dr. Valentine now takes up "the chaos of ideas in the Manual's attempt to present the Roman Church's doctrine," and that of "the other Protestant Churches," respecting the sacraments. The Manual says: "These two elements are not to be confused, neither are they to be separated the one from the other. * * The Roman Catholics mix the outward element and the invisible grace." The leading word here is "confused," and means that the Romish theory of transubstantiation unduly confounds, commingles, and mixes the relations between the outward and inward eucharistical elements. This Dr. Valentine contends might apply to consubstantiation but "utterly misses" the conception of transubstantiation. Let us see. In transubstantiation the *substance* of the bread and wine is changed into the *substance* of the body and blood of Christ. This indeed, as far as it goes, is no confusing or commingling. But it is to be remembered that the theory holds that the *accidents* are not so changed. To sight, touch, and taste, the outward elements remain bread and wine. Had these too been displaced, then there had been no confusion, but a total substitution. But now when we have the whole substance of the bread and wine changed into the whole

substance of the body and blood, while yet the accidents of bread and wine remain with all their sensible properties, is this not an identification of the outward with the inward element which can be truly characterized by the term used in the Manual? If the substance of a man's body was changed into the substance of his soul, and yet the accidents or sensible properties and appearance of his body remained unchanged, would not this be about as total a "confusion" of the spiritual and physical sides of the man's personality as could be imagined?

The great church historian, Kurtz, thus contrasts the Lutheran with both the Romish and Reformed view: "The tendency prevails in the Catholic Church to *confound* these two, the divine and the human, and that indeed in such a way that the human loses its human character, and its union with the divine is regarded as *constituting identity*. The Reformed Church, again, is prone to *separate* the two, to look upon the divine by itself, and the human by itself. But the Lutheran Church guarding against any *confusion* as well as any *separation* of the two elements, had sought to view the union as the most vital, rich, and inward communion, interpenetration and reciprocity."* [Italics ours]. Here this learned authority characterizes the error of the Romish theory in almost the same phrases and by the very term "*confusion* of the two elements," employed by the Manual. The parallelism of the passages is so close that I fear the charge of misrepresentation will now be changed to one of plagiarism. But if the Manual be guilty of such erroneous teaching, what shall be thought of the fact that Kurtz's Church History, which inculcates the same errors in almost identical phraseology, is employed as a text-book of Lutheranism in the very theological institution over which Dr. Valentine presides! Certainly, if it be so defective, it should be displaced from its high position of authority not only there, but in many American theological seminaries.

But this charge of misrepresentation of the Romish Church, is introduced as a mere foil to the introduction of a charge,

*Vol. II., p. 140.

which arouses Dr. Valentine far more, and which is the real *gravamen* of my offence. This is "an unnecessary and uncalled for misrepresentation—standing as it does, as a wholesale charge against the 'other Protestant Churches,' *i. e.* all non-Lutheran communions." The clauses objected to are: "The other Protestant Churches violently disjoin and separate the invisible and the visible elements, for they deny that the latter are instruments of the former. They teach that the earthly elements are only figures or *signs*, and not *means* of grace. That the participant receives no grace whatever through the sacramental elements. Whatever blessings he experiences at the time, he receives through his mind or spirit, entirely apart from the external use." Now this delineation was written with the utmost desire to set forth the position of the non-Lutheran communions temperately and justly, and is guarded with scrupulous care. It does not deny but positively affirms that these communions believe that grace is connected with the celebration of the sacraments. But what it does teach is that they differ as to *the manner in which that grace is conveyed*, the Lutheran holding that it is conveyed through "the earthly elements" as "*means*," and the Reformed holding that the earthly elements are but "*signs*," and that the grace or "blessings experienced at the time are received through the mind or spirit." Now this is so clearly expressed that he must be sorely pressed to find objection, who would seek to pervert its meaning. Compare with this presentation the language which Dr. Kurtz uses, thus: "The Reformed Church, again, is prone to separate the two, to look upon the divine by itself, and the human by itself. * * It was inclined rather to *sever completely the divine in Christianity from its earthly, visible vehicle*, and to think of the operation of the divine upon man as merely spiritual. In the doctrine of the sacraments supernatural grace and the earthly elements were *separated* from one another."* This is in every respect as strong as the Manual, and it lacks the Manual's charitable limitation to the effect that the non-Lutheran Churches do teach a reception of grace in the sacrament,

*Church History, Vol. II., pp. 345, 346.

"The root of the divergence lies in the very nature of Christianity; and

but not through the earthly elements as means. So carefully is this guarded that Dr. Valentine is forced to admit that "in the sentences quoted the predicate 'not means of grace' stands grammatically connected immediately *merely with the subject, earthly elements.*" [Italics ours]. When, then, Dr. Valentine must admit that the Manual only teaches that the Reformed view denies that supernatural grace is communicated directly through "the earthly elements," and specifies that their Churches consider sacramental grace as coming alone through "the mind or spirit" of the communicant, how he can proceed to argue that it denies that they teach any sacramental grace whatever, is most extraordinary. The words that this view "deprives the sacrament of all *direct efficacy*," he knows very well, and every reader knows, intimate no such thing, but mean just what they say, that if grace is not given through the sacramental elements, but directly to the soul apart from their agency, then there is no "*direct sacramental efficacy*," but only an indirect and, strictly speaking, non-sacramental one. It is not an efficacy mediated by the sacramental agents, but by something else.

Yet now Dr. Valentine proceeds by lengthy citations to contend that "the great body of the Protestant Churches" do "believe that the sacraments are 'means of grace,'" in the sense in which the Manual declares that they do not. This is indeed a novel situation for an official Lutheran theologian. No wonder that he finds it most *apropos* to declare that in this procedure he is not inspired by any spirit of championship for these various

there can be no satisfactory solution of the differences between the Zwinglio-Calvinistic, and the Lutheran Reformations, and the Churches which were established upon them, except this, that the one accepted the true, the other a mistaken meaning of God's word, on certain points. * * * Our dispute is not as to *how* Christ is present, but as to whether there be a *true*, not an ideal presence. It is the *essence* [italics Dr. Krauth's] of the doctrine, not its form, which divides us from the *Reformed*.—*Conservative Reformation*, pp. 457, 458. These words of our greatest American Lutheran scholar are far stronger than the Manual's words, p. 53: "The view of the Lord's Supper which she holds and confesses, in harmony with the saints of old, has been either lost sight of or definitely repudiated by the great majority of other Protestants."

denominations." But the disclaimer swiftly vanishes before the ardor of the defence. But when a Lutheran theologian parades the confessions of other Churches to show that they teach anything like the theory of sacramental grace held by Lutherans, he will soon collide with rigid facts. So Dr. Valentine's very first citation from the First Helvetic Confession (1536) utterly overthrows his contention: "In the eucharist the bread and the wine are *signs*, but the reality is the communion of the body of the Lord, attained salvation and remission of sins. Which things are *spiritually received by faith*, as the signs are with the bodily mouth." Here the bread and wine are specifically declared to be *signs* and faith is made the *means*. Dr. Schaff, in his Church History, defines the difference thus, under "The Eucharistic Theories Compared": "Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli differ on three points—the mode of Christ's presence, whether corporeal or spiritual; the organ of receiving his body and blood, (*whether by the mouth, or by faith*, and the extent of their reception, whether by all or only by believers.)" In the confession which Zwingli presented at Augsburg he says: "I believe, yea, I know that all the sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not even convey or distribute it. My opinion here is fixed. For as grace is produced or given by the divine Spirit, so this gift pertains to the Spirit alone. Moreover, a channel or vehicle is not necessary to the Spirit. * * I believe therefore that a sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing—*i. e.* of a grace that has been given. I believe that it is a visible figure of invisible grace."* And, however Calvin may have approached in feeling more closely the Lutheran view, still in the last analysis, he is fundamentally diverse. The exegete Meyer, whom Dr. Valentine subsequently quotes with such favor, thus quotes Calvin's comment on the words of institution: "*externum signum dicitur id esse, quod figurat*," and remarks: "There is no difference of an exegetical nature between the interpretation of Zwingli and that of Calvin."

Compare then with these positions defined by the Reformed

*Book of Concord, Vol. II., pp. 168, 169.

themselves the Manual's statement: "The other Protestant Churches teach that *the earthly elements* are only figures or *signs*, and *not means* of grace. That the participant receives no grace whatever *through the sacramental [earthly] elements*. Whatever blessings he experiences at the time, he receives *through his mind or spirit*." It will be seen that the statements of the Manual and of the Reformed, as to the latter's position, are quite coincident.

Writes an eminent theologian of our Church: "It is not difficult to accumulate authorities from Reformed theologians and confessions that speak of means of grace. But the use of the term is one thing, the right to use it another, just as some men call themselves Lutherans without being such." Yet even from their own confessed positions we have shown that they do not profess to teach that the sacramental elements are means, but only signs or figures of grace. Nevertheless Dr. Valentine makes the bold general statement: "Beyond all question, however they [the other Protestant Churches] differ in sacramental view from the Lutheran faith, they furnish no shadow of warrant for the wholesale representation that they do not believe that the sacraments are 'means of grace.'" This is indeed a surprising "championship" of the sacramental teaching of the non-Lutheran Churches. Verily, that they agree with the Lutherans in affirming that the sacraments are "means of grace," will be news to both parties. Either Dr. Valentine means that the Reformed use the term "means of grace" in the same sense that Lutherans do, or he does not. If he means the latter, the assertion is dishonest and misleading, and this we cannot attribute to him. He must then mean it in the former. And what an assertion is that, refuted as it is by the whole body of Calvinistic and Zwinglian theology, and by all historic controversy.

To show how widely prevalent loose and erroneous views concerning the Lord's Supper still are in "the other Protestant Churches," we have but to read Dr. Maclaren's significant sermon in the May number of the *Homiletic Review*, just issued. Its theme is "The Lord's Supper a Declaratory Rite." He says, (pp. 410, 411): "Of the Lord's Supper:—It is a proclamation

of the death of Christ. That is all. A parable is a spoken symbol ; a symbol is an acted parable. Such is, as the apostle says, the nature of this rite. Throughout the whole context *there is not a single word that goes beyond such a conception of the Lord's Supper. It is a memorial* [italics ours]. * * I believe that there is no logical standing ground between these two conceptions of the Lord's Supper 'Ye do show the Lord's death,' and on the other hand the extreme Roman Catholic view." There is scarcely living to-day a more widely influential and thoroughly representative clergyman of the Reformed Churches than Dr. Maclaren. And Zwingli himself could not go further than the bald "declaratory" view here upheld. No wonder that Dr. Hodge (Systematic Theology, Vol. III., p. 503), cites the Lutheran Guericke as complaining "that the Reformed teach that the visible signs do not as such convey any invisible divine grace ; and that without the sacraments the Christian may enjoy through faith the same divine gifts which the sacraments were intended to convey." Dr. Valentine will receive little thanks from Dr. Maclaren and his friends for affiliating them with the Lutheran, which they abhor quite as much as "the extreme Roman Catholic view."

Would that the voice and pen of Dr. Valentine were as readily enlisted in defence of "uncalled for misrepresentation" and "sweeping depreciation" of Lutheran views and Lutherans, as he here rushes to the breach in defence of our ecclesiastical opponents. Abounding as these do in America, the occasion to speak in "championship" of our own, is certainly far more pressing to the loyal defender, than in behalf of other communions.

More surprising still is the objection to the Manual's remark that "no other Protestant confession now professes to teach "the Real Presence." It will be remembered that these confessions principally date from the Reformation era. They were then largely permeated with the Lutheran conservative spirit which was dominant. But just as the Zwinglian and Calvinistic Churches three hundred years ago were all more or less liturgic, but have now largely lost these characteristics, so the interpretation of these confessions has become less and less Lutheran as respects the sacraments. So that Prof. Foster of the Pacific Theological

Seminary (Congregational) in the *Independent* of April 12th, asks the Episcopal Church, as a decisive obstacle to union: "Let the bishops frankly answer: What is the prevailing drift in your communion as to the doctrine of the *Real Presence* in the sacrament?" Dr. Hodge says directly, "Calvin denied the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, in the sense in which that presence was asserted by Lutherans."* And (page 676) he declares the points between Luther and Calvin, into which he enters in detail, to constitute an "*essential difference*." Dr. Valentine will doubtless be the only one among us who can find the Real Presence in the other Protestant confessions. The only approach to it is in the XXXIX Articles, and here he will need Dean Stanley's ingenious explanation. After stating that Lutheran expressions intimating the doctrine were expurgated by Zwinglian revisers, and Zwinglian ones substituted, and then that the former were restored by the side of the latter, he says naively: "Excellently well done was it," says an old Anglican divine, "of Queen Elizabeth and her Reformers to link both together: for between the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and the sacramental commemoration of his Passion, there is so inseparable a league as *subsist* they cannot, except they *consist*."[†] We leave Dr. Valentine to get over by some such similar expedient the "*inseparable league*" of distance between the Lutheran and Reformed confessions.

Dr. Valentine cannot drop this criticism without his accustomed severity. "The Lutheran Church has done nothing to deserve the humiliation" the Manual does her in this "unfair lowering of the rest of Protestantism, to glorify her." And "the various denominations are entitled to make their own defence if they deem this representation of sufficient weight to need correction," [italics ours]. To ward off this disdainful thrust I may be permitted to say that the Manual was not written for other denominations, but for Lutherans. Hence but two copies were sent outside of the Lutheran Church. One to that representative

**Systematic Theology*, Vol. III., p. 628.

[†]*Christian Institutions*, p. 91.

journal, the *Independent*, which commends it highly as "an excellent Manual, from a thoroughly intelligent source," and commends it to the study of those who "wish to know what the practices and general spirit" of "the Lutheran Church are, which is in this country on the ground that it is the Mother Church of our common Protestant Christianity." The *Independent* takes very kindly to it, and sees nothing in it of that unfair and depreciatory spirit against the other Protestant Churches, which so excites Dr. Valentine's very nearly contemptuous indignation. The other copy was sent to that scholarly Presbyterian, Rev. Henry M. Booth, D. D., President of Auburn Theological Seminary, who has himself written one the richest and most devotional books, from the Calvinistic standpoint, on the Lord's Supper, entitled "The First Communion." He writes thus respecting it, and his words show how thorough has been his examination: "I have read with care your interesting Manual, and wish now to express my satisfaction with your work. I have enjoyed your enthusiasm which is evident and delightful; I have admired your learning which is sound and broad; I have respected your convictions which are sincere and intelligent; I have appreciated your conservatism which is safe and encouraging; I can agree to most of your statements. If modern Lutheranism is true to your representations, I say, 'God bless the Lutheran Church.' Besides, I am glad to see the important work of 'Manual' preparation so well done. We need just such manuals, and yours is a model, so interesting that it will be read, and so instructive that it will be read with profit." The writer need not apologize for presenting this letter in this connection. Nothing could more effectually demonstrate the groundlessness of the charge that he has heaped "humiliation" upon the Lutheran Church among other churches, by his "unfair, uncalled for statements" "against them" in the Manual. And that a Calvinist, with a Lutherizing spirit, should invoke "blessings" upon a staunch Lutheran book, while a Lutheran with a not very pronounced Lutheran spirit, should call down maledictions upon it, is not so strange or new a spectacle after all.

My own experience has shown that representatives of other

Churches want to see in a Lutheran, and to learn from him, what distinct phase of Christain doctrine and life Lutheranism stands for. And nothing can be more disappointing to them than if they find that his Lutheranism is but as thin as a shadow, and as hollow as a name. To Lutheran theological students who may be reading this article the writer would, not without some measure of experience, say : "If you want to bring 'humiliation' upon your Church, be ashamed of her distinctive characteristics and speak apologetically and depreciatingly of staunch Lutherans and of historic Lutheran usages. But if you wish your Church to be respected, and you yourselves to rise with her, glorify her doctrines, vindicate her claims, and represent her just as she is. Remember that self-respect is the peremptory condition of securing the respect of others."

Dr. Valentine objects to the Manual's explanation of the relation between the visible and invisible constituents of a sacrament, that the body and blood of Christ are identified with the sacramental grace itself. And then he says: "The discussion proceeds right along to refer to the body and blood of Christ" as what Lutheran theology means by the *grace offered and given* through the sacramental elements." In the part objected to, the Manual is defining the relation in Lutheran theology between the visible part of a sacrament and the invisible grace of which it is the means. It quotes from Hollazius: "Sacraments are holy rites, appointed by God, through which, by means of visible signs, grace is imparted to man." It then illustrates this by Baptism and the Lord's Supper. And as in baptism the grace is immediately communicated through water, the visible sign, so in drawing the parallel with the Lord's Supper, it naturally specifies that invisible gift which is immediately communicated by the visible signs, viz., the body and blood of Christ. And only confusing would it be in this brief and general statement to define that in the case of the Lord's Supper, the parallelism is not complete, because the body and blood is not directly the sacramental grace, but only that which is bound up with, and communicative of it. Dr. Valentine, to sustain his misrepresentation, avoids quoting the crucial passage, where the relation is

stated with the explicitness of theological definition, p. 38. "So, in the Lord's Supper, the outward or *visible elements* are bread and wine, and the *invisible elements* given through them are the body and blood of Christ." And that the "grace" of the Lord's Supper is not identified or inseparably bound up with these "in-visible elements" is made explicit by the attendant cautionary statements p. 42: "The sacraments *confer no grace* on adults, unless when offered, they receive it, *by true faith* which existed previously (Hollazius). "All Lutherans attach all the efficacy of the sacrament to the *Word of God*. Our theologians teach that strictly speaking there is but *one means* of salvation, which is distinguished as the audible and visible word." So explicit are these statements that Dr. Valentine is compelled to admit as over against his criticism: "It is to be freely conceded that the author of the Manual did not *mean* that his representations should involve any such conclusions and results as these. There are passages that in themselves teach just the reverse. p. 39 he says: "He who observes them *with faith* receives *their grace* to his unspeakable good, and he who observes them impenitently profanes them to his nameless hurt. And on pp. 41 and 42 quotations from the Augsburg Confession and the dogmati-cians are aptly introduced to assert the need of faith in order to the attainment through the sacrament of the grace they offer."

Despite, however, this admission, which shows the practical futility of his point of contention, Dr. Valentine makes this allegation: "The representation runs on and on, in varied forms of reassertion, in a confused way with here and there an expression faintly implying in the writer's mind some lurking and obscure reminiscences of some better but now forgotten idea of the "invisible grace"—till in the chapter on the Lord's Supper, the statements settle down into steady representation of the "body and blood" of the Lord, present in the elements, as the "invisible grace conveyed. It would be difficult to present a more faulty, unauthorized, and misleading idea of the Lutheran teaching in this respect." Would any one who reads through this lengthy and involved diatribe, believe that the definition in the all too brief chapter on this precious Lutheran doctrine of

the Lord's Supper is given in these careful terms, according with the strictest theological exactitude, to wit, (p. 34): "The body and blood are the *invisible divine element*, [*res coelestis*], the bread and wine are the visible earthly element. And the relation of the two *elements* is that the *earthly* is the means of the *heavenly?*" And would any reader believe further, that in this whole chapter the term "invisible grace" never occurs but once, and then not in a clause that even refers to the body and blood of Christ, but in connection with (p. 54) "the *meaning of a sacrament*, viz., an invisible grace conveyed through a visible, earthly vessel!"

But the primary purport of this chapter of the Manual is to quite another point, viz., to urge that distinctive confessional article of our Church, the REAL PRESENCE. The argument all the way through is to scripturally prove and demonstrate, in such a way as to carry popular conviction, that great doctrinal corner-stone of Lutheranism as over against Zwinglianism and Calvinism, which constitutes the Xth Article of the Augsburg Confession, viz.: "Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the *true Body and Blood of Christ are TRULY PRESENT* under the form of bread and wine, and are there communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper, and received." This is the precious gospel truth and Lutheran distinctive doctrine which the Manual, discarding minor and insignificant definitions, is there seeking to portray with an earnestness for which no apology is presented here. Every loyal Lutheran knows how crucial a point this is, and what a lever it is for giving power to Lutheran theology, for conferring symmetry upon the whole Lutheran system, for irresistibly convincing the popular mind, and for arousing interest in, and winning converts to the Lutheran Church. Not one spark of warmth however, does this presentation touch in Dr. Valentine, but only a chill of revulsion does the whole chapter cause to run shivering through his theological frame. Let us hope, as we trust for a future for our Church in this country, that besides a very few and their ever narrowing following, no other Lutherans will be similarly affected by this, however defective, yet honest attempt of a loving son to honor his so often misrepresented and dishonored ecclesiastical mother.

Evidently what has proved so repelling to Dr. Valentine in the treatment of the sacraments, or rather of the Lord's Supper, is the Manual's insistence on bringing into such chief prominence the body and blood of Christ, as that object upon which the communicant is to fix his attention, as determining the objective efficacy of the sacrament. And yet here the Manual only follows natural Lutheran tendencies as contradistinguished from Reformed ones. The Lutheran thinks of the precious body and blood of Christ as that with which the strengthening grace of the sacrament is so closely bound, that receiving it in faith, he feels that it becomes to him "life, remission of sins, and salvation." Not in a single instance does the Manual say that the body and blood of Christ *are* the invisible grace of the Lord's Supper. But in every direct definition it says as p. 54, "The body and blood are the invisible *divine element*, the bread and wine are the visible *earthly element*," and p. 60, "Her Lord gives to his believing disciples his body as the bread of their spiritual life, and his blood for the remission of sins." But in general sacramental definitions, for brevity and explicitness, befitting a popular treatise, it is assumed that these elements, taken in faith, are the equivalent of the grace they bestow. And how utterly hypercritical the objection to this treatment is will appear in reading our great theologians on the Lord's Supper! Thus, Chemnitz, in a most powerful passage on the efficacy of the sacrament, depicting the divine love and grace poured out in the Lord's Supper, immediately particularizes it thus: "For that body which he delivered for us unto death, he gives to us in the Supper for food, that by it, as divine and life-giving food, we may live, may be nurtured and grow and strengthen."^{*} Here, just as does the Manual, the divine element in the Supper is used as the equivalent of the grace it is designed to impart. Such linguistic usage is of course offensive to Reformed theologians, who desire to repress any thought of a presence of Christ's body and blood, but it is natural to Lutheran theologians, who wish to make prominent that presence. And in fact, the very same mode of

*Conservative Reformation, Krauth, p. 828.

speech is used by the Lord himself, for when he says, "This is my Body," he only means the medium of his Body, and so when St. Paul says, "The cup is the communion of the Blood of Christ," he does not mean that the cup is the wine, but only the instrument by which it is imparted. Yet all these representations are as precisely open as is the Manual to Dr. Valentine's charge of "chaos of ideas," on the ground that they identify the grace of the sacraments with their instruments. Assuredly, time could not be wasted over more fruitless cavils than these against the ordinary freedom and usage of language. This charge is identical with that which Harnack makes against Luther. In his history of dogma (pp. 562 and 563) he accuses Luther with "The confounding of grace and the means of grace"—that he "transferred that which pertained to the word to the idea *vocale verbum et sacramenta*" and "returned to the narrow circle of the Middle Ages * * by maintaining the real presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist as the *essential element* of the sacrament." Did not Dr. Valentine borrow this charge against the Manual from this famous rationalist? It certainly looks so.

Dr. Valentine cannot quit this point without a sly thrust that after this glorying in the Real Presence, as the peculiar treasure of the Lutheran Church, the Manual "returns upon its track with inconsistent representation," because it declares that this loyalty to scripture doctrine "anchors Lutheranism safely *in the conservative faith of the whole Christian Church* as over against the deadly inroads of modern rationalism. So that, after all, the Lutheran communion is simply in harmony with the conservative faith of the whole Church!" The cutting satire, and the invincible logic here, are to the effect that if any part of Christendom degenerates into error then there remains no historic Christian faith! Does Dr. Valentine then contend that because there are errorists in every age, there is no consensus of Christian orthodoxy, no accepted historic standard by which these vagaries are to be tested and corrected? This is indeed a startling position to take. A single illustration will demonstrate its utter fallacy. Luther in a letter to Albert of Prussia in

the year 1532, in the very act of protesting against the Romish error of Transubstantiation on the one hand, and on the other against the dangerous errors of the sacramentarians in their denial of the Real Presence, uses these words: "Moreover this article has been unanimously believed and held from the beginning of the Christian Church to the present hour, as may be shown from the books and writings of the dear fathers, both in the Greek and Latin languages,—which testimony of the entire holy Christian Church ought to be sufficient for us, even if we had nothing more. For it is dangerous and dreadful to hear or believe anything against the unanimous testimony, faith, and doctrine of the entire holy Christian Church, as it has been held unanimously in all the world up to this year 1500." As Luther is here doing just what the Manual is, viz., urging the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence, and as he is protesting against the same departures and errorists that the Manual is, and as he reverts to the same authority that the Manual does, viz., "*the unanimous testimony, faith and doctrine of the entire holy Christian Church,*" the author begs that Dr. Valentine's sarcastic innuendoes be transferred to Luther's broader shoulders. This, at all events, is only just, inasmuch as the great Saxon Reformer is principally responsible for what the writer is here called upon to endure at the hands of his irate reviewer.

Dr. Valentine now assails the "so-called Manual," because though "the chapter treating on baptism" "has been in most respects fairly conceived and temperately written, it substantially represents the Lutheran Church as holding the doctrine that infants 'believe,' or 'have faith' as a presupposition for baptism." I answer, that in the four lines touching on this point, the Manual does no such thing. There is not the remotest reference in the passage to the position of the Lutheran Church on the question. It is only introduced as an individual argument to sustain our Church's practice of infant baptism,—that is all. And to do this the question is asked in a tentative form: "But has not our Lord answered this when he says: 'One of these little ones which believe in me, (Matt. 18 : 6)'?" And then the question is given two answers, the first favoring this view, the other sug-

gesting a contrary theory, thus: "Luther interpreted this as an unconscious faith, discernible to God alone. Augustine [contrariwise] argues that in the case of children: 'The faith of the Church [represented by Christian parents or sponsors] takes the place of their own faith.'" Is it not perfectly clear to the intelligent, or even non-intelligent reader, that here are proposed two theories, the one exclusive of the other, to justify the baptism of infants, and therefore that the "faith of infants" is only introduced as possibly correct, and possibly not, and is in no way put forth as the authoritative teaching of our Church? And as I have cited the entire passage, I leave the reader for himself to judge of Dr. Valentine's ability and fitness to speak with such a judicial and *ex cathedra* air, as he assumes all through this review, when he alleges that the Manual introduces Augustine's view of a faith of the Church "to support" the view of "a faith of infants," when it is self-evident that it cites his view precisely for the opposite purpose.

It was not the purpose of the Manual to discuss the question of the faith of infants. Luther's view is given in the Larger Catechism, where he says: "with respect to infant baptism, we bring forward the child under the impression and the hope that it believes." In the Wittenberg Concordia he says: "that there are in them movements and inclinations to believe the Lord Christ and to love God, in some measure similar to the movements of those who otherwise [intelligently] have faith and love." But while Luther, thus as we have done, in a manual of religious instruction, advanced the theory, yet the detailed analysis of the matter he regards of but "little importance," and "hands it over," as we do, "to the discussion of the doctors."

As to the exposition of the passage (Matt. 18 : 6) to which, among others, Luther appealed, Dr. Valentine settles it in the same summary style in which he is wont to deal with the Manual, saying, "To interpret 'these little ones which believe on me' as literal children would destroy the very use for which 'the child' was set in the midst as a type, and disregard the whole demand of the context." On the other hand it is just the context and

the whole scene and surroundings which seem to demand that *μικρῶν* here includes in its significance little children, and to deny it that sense is to destroy its force in the beautiful passage that follows in the tenth verse, viz.: "For I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." To sustain his exposition Dr. Valentine cites Meyer: "Not to be understood any more than *παῖδες τοῖοῦτο*, v. 5, of little *children* and consequently not to be used as proof of the faith of little children." Dr. Valentine's procedure here is perfectly characteristic. A passage which seems to buttress the Lutheran doctrine of sacramental grace is to be invalidated, and to do it an exegete is referred to, as of supreme authority, who is no Lutheran and who accordingly denies that doctrine. Let us hear what this same Meyer has to say on the crucial passages relating to the Holy Supper. On Matt. 26: 26-28 he says: "The idea of a spiritual body communicated [through the sacramental bread] belongs entirely to the region of non-exegetical and docetic fancies—it follows that *εστί* is neither more nor less than the *copula of the symbolic statement* [the Calvinist and Zwinglian view] as opposed to the *copula of actual being*," [the Lutheran view]. Of course an exegete who is so set against any scriptural interpretation which will support the Lutheran view of eucharistical grace will be just as likely not to see in other crucial passages a basis for baptismal grace. As the view of an exegete depends so largely upon his prepossession, we prefer to take the exposition of a Lutheran, as Stier, who says in his "Words of the Lord Jesus," on Matt. 18: 6: "The whole of what is said in verses 5 and 6 is rightly to be understood and used of the *little child*." Or, of a commentator not of our Church, who yet sympathizes with our sacramental view, as Alford, who says: "There is no doubt that *children are included* in the word *μικροί*. The whole discourse is in deep and constant reference to the *covenant with infants*, which was to be made and ratified by an ordinance." That that prince of theologians, Chemnitz, held the same view is shown by his words: "That operation of the Spirit in infants we call faith, and we affirm that they believe. For that mean or organ, by which

the kingdom of God, offered in the word and sacraments, is received, the Scripture calls faith. *And in Matt. 18 : 6 Christ speaks of the little ones which believe in him.*" Spener, in the *Tabulae Catecheticae*, asks: "Can children also believe, are they also capable of faith? Yes, they are capable of faith, *Matt. 18 : 6 ; 19 : 14*. Wherefore? Because they are capable of salvation, but without faith, and indeed without personal faith, no one will be saved, *Heb. 2 : 4*. What kind of faith do children have? A true and divine faith. How long do they retain this faith? Until they begin to be capable of the ordinary means of faith, which is the word of God." The same view of the passage was held by that eminent biblical scholar and theologian, the late Dr. Krauth. No occasion whatever, therefore, was there for taking objection to the guarded statement made here. The "so-called Manual," and the editors of the Development of Luther's Catechism, who are at this point of the critique brought in for their share of scoring, find themselves in most excellent Lutheran company.

Thereupon follow eleven pages, more than one-third of the Dr.'s whole article, heavily encumbered with "extended quotations" of theological authorities upon a question of which it is admitted that "the handbook does not treat." What purpose their introduction can have unless it be to give an air of theological ponderosity to the paper, or to fill up a vacuum in the task of finding errors in the Manual, the writer is surely unable to discern. Yet to show in a word how all these quotations are used to misrepresent Lutheran theology as dissenting from the propriety of the use of the term "child-faith" even *after* baptism, we only need to give the uncompromising testimony of Schmid in his Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, who says: "The dogmaticians maintain *most positively*, upon the authority of *Titus 3 : 5*, that faith is produced in children through baptism." So even Hagenbach, the Reformed historian of dogma, asserts: "The Lutherans, after the precedence of Luther assumed an actual faith on the part of children." The most casual reader can here see how little dependence is to be placed

upon Dr. Valentine's statements as an exponent of Lutheran confessional theology.

The effort to convict the Manual of inconsistency, as though on one page it affirmed that the Power of the Keys belonged immediately to the ministry, and on another that it belonged immediately to the congregation, is a most disastrous failure. The two passages mutually interpret and sustain each other. The one is: "To the Church, moreover, through the ministerial office pertains the *Power of the Keys*" (p. 118). The other is: "As Lutherans hold the universal priesthood of all believers, *the ministerial office*, and hence 'the Power of the Keys,' is rooted in the congregation. For the sake of order it simply delegates its rights to some fellow member that he may officiate for all." The two statements accordingly are: That the Power of the Keys "pertains to" or "is rooted in," *i. e.* belongs originally to the congregation. And that through "the ministerial office" [the significant part of the quotation which Dr. Valentine omits], which is likewise "rooted in the congregation," and grows out of it, this Power of the Keys is administered. The two statements accordingly are but interdependent and complementary. The XXVIIIth Article of the Augsburg Confession teaches thus: "The Power of the Keys, or the power of the bishops, by the rule of the Gospel, is a power or commandment from God, of preaching the Gospel, of remitting or retaining sins, and of administering the sacraments. For Christ doth send his Apostles with the charge: 'As the Father hath sent me, even so I send you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained,'" (John 20: 21-23). "Again, by the Gospel, bishops, *i. e.* those who have the administration of the word and sacraments committed to them, have no other jurisdiction at all, but only to remit sin, to exclude from the communion of the Church, &c. And herein of necessity the churches ought by divine right to render obedience to them. But when they teach or determine anything contrary to the Gospel, then have the churches a commandment of God, which forbiddeth obedience to them." It will be observed here that the Power of the Keys

is called "power of the bishops, by the rule of the Gospel, or commandment of God," "by divine right," to which "of necessity the churches ought by divine right to render obedience unto them." How much stronger is this affirmation than the Manual's that "*To the Church*, moreover, through the ministerial office, *pertains the Power of the Keys*." Nor is it attended with a word about what the Manual is so careful to add, viz., that this Power of the Keys is wholly "rooted in the congregation," as is also the ministerial office, through which it administers this power. If the Manual, thus, is guilty of inconsistency with itself, much more is the Augsburg Confession inconsistent with the other confessions, and if "the Manual's statement faces to hierarchical theory," far more does that of the Augustana. Of course the one charge is just as groundless as the other.* Aye! if our great confessions only did not have their immovable position of authority, how fiercely their doctrines and forms of expression would be arraigned as hyper-Lutheran, and what cumulative argumentation and evidence would demonstrate them to be ultra-orthodox, hierarchical, and Romanizing!

The presentation of the Manual respecting Lutheran worship, services, &c., is also objectionable to Dr. Valentine. "Very great stress is everywhere placed upon externals. The principle of the comparative importance of things, while in a measure admitted, is not fairly observed and carried out. * * This characteristic is illustrated in the stress laid on particular and uniform services, observance of the whole church *pericope*, &c." The Manual denounces ritualism, and opposes excessive or wearisome services. It simply advocates the moderate historical services of the Lutheran Church; and, encouraging the Lutheran view of sacred art, as a resultant of the spiritual insight of Luther's large personality, it yet is cautious to thus modify the application of the principle: "Hence the *Lutheran Observer* is quite correct in this recent editorial: 'However, the whole matter of

*If any proof were needed to show the writer's uncompromising attitude with respect to hierarchical pretensions in any shape whatever, his letter to the *Independent*, April 12th, 1894, on the claims of the Protestant Episcopal Church, would be decisive.

church decoration with Christian symbols and other works of art, within appropriate limits belongs to the *adiaphora*, or things indifferent and things non-essential, and these are free to be used or not, according to the taste or preference of congregations, so far as not forbidden in the Scriptures," (p. 172).

A conservative and historical church, like the Lutheran, naturally expresses its inner distinctive life in an harmonious outer form. And while theoretically this "external order" is of very little moment as compared with the preëminent value of truth, yet *practically*, as every sagacious observer cannot but see, it becomes a matter of no inconsiderable importance. This is especially true with respect to the laity, they to whom we must look for our progress and strength. The laity do not easily grasp the distinctive doctrines of the various Churches. Many of these points they are apt to look upon as abstruse and profitless theological abstractions, fitted only to the doctors. But the "external order" of a church, which presents in visible form its inner doctrinal life and spirit, they can easily grasp. Besides, this is something tangible for them. Thus they can recognize their Church, and to these characteristics they can grow attached. Their children become fond of them, and through these familiar services they recognize their own church home. And as these bonds grow stronger with years, they become the most powerful tie to hold the children to the Church of their fathers. What an instance of the power of this principle do we not have in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the weakest of all the Churches in doctrine, one of the very smallest in numbers, and unfortunate in having so tedious a liturgy? Yet all these disadvantages are in practice more than counterbalanced by one simple fact, viz., the possession of a definite and uniform order of service. Hence an Episcopalian knows an Episcopal service, or an Episcopalian wedding or funeral ceremony at a glance, and non-Episcopalians are almost as familiar with them. And what an incalculable advantage this gives a Church, both in inciting the devotion of its own members, and in recommending its services to the favor of the Christian public. Not for any ritualistic reason, but for this supremely *practical* reason, and because the author sees how

near the matter lies to church advancement, is it that the Manual gives whatever prominence it does to the inherently insignificant matter of outward order? And the writer cannot but confess his amazement that his Lutheran brethren, whether low or high ecclesiastically, General Synod or General Council, conservative or latitudinarian, do not see this point. The lowest and most anti-ritualistic Episcopalian sees it just as forcibly as does the High-churchman. He does not find that this uniform order fetters his extremest doctrinal freedom in the least. And so should all parties among us, who, as Bismarck says, have eyes, see it. The simple, popular service of the Lutheran Church, here gives her an incomparable opportunity, if she but have the sagacity to embrace it.

In our earlier American English history all our Lutheran distinctive external features, to our disastrous loss, were discarded at the beck of dominant Puritanism, Zwinglianism, and Calvinism. But Dr. Morris has lately presented some manly and healthful sentiments at Gettysburg indicating to the leaders there that these days were past beyond recall, and we had trusted that they were being taken to heart. Said Dr. Morris, at the recent laying of the corner-stone of the new seminary building: "Formerly we were taught that every thing distinctive among nominally orthodox churches was of small account, and hence that one Christian Church was as good as another, and that our great aim should be to unite our efforts in sustaining a Utopian plan of universal combination.

A church responsive service was deprecated,—even the ancient chant in worship was decried in the leading church paper as popish, and stained-glass windows, the figure of the cross in the church or surmounting steeples, and the clerical robe, were put on a level with the popish rosary and confessional."

But it seems that these prejudices still survive where we should least expect them. The Manual gives a presentation of historical Lutheran liturgical principles, enforced by the highest authorities. And it advocates the universal Lutheran service, in its broad outlines. It could do no less than this and give that information which it sets out to give as an "epitome of the doc-

trines, usages, spirit and life of the Lutheran Church, in such large outlines, as are common to all synods, branches and sections." To be faithful to this task, the Manual could not portray the Lutheran Church as it exists in some exceptional parts of America, where the historical Lutheran service is disused or even rejected, where the Gospels and Epistles for the day are unread,—a disregard of Lutheran order otherwise unknown in all Lutheran history, and in the whole Lutheran world—and where scarcely a single feature distinctive of the historical Lutheran Church meets the eye.

But he has portrayed it as it can be found in all Lutheran countries, and as it *is* found in nineteen-twentieths of all Lutheran Churches of whatever nationality or language in this country. The external order of the Manual is not an "exaggerated ideal," but it is simply the order set forth by the three great General Bodies of this country, and adopted by the English branch of the fourth. It is the only English order that can truly be called Lutheran, and the only one that has the least chance of becoming the order of the one great, united, American Lutheran Church. And to give another cumulative instance of the simplicity and popularity of this service, the writer begs permission to cite the following recent testimonial. A short time since at a meeting of eminent clergy in New York city, the renowned Dr. J. M. Buckley, editor of the *Christian Advocate*, turned to the writer and said in emphatic tones: "I lately worshiped where I had the pleasure of hearing the full Lutheran [Common] Service, and I wish to say here that of all the services I have heard in manifold churches, all over the world, the Lutheran service, for spirituality, scripturalness, devotion and brevity, comes up most perfectly to my ideal of a service for the public worship of God. And had I my way I would introduce it into every Methodist congregation in the land." How this dispassionate testimony of an eminent Christian, to whom the least shadow of excessive liturgy would be instinctively revolting, sets its condemnation upon the utterly groundless charges made by some Lutherans of the "elaborateness," and "prolixity," and "complexity," and "ritualistic propensities" of their own external order!

Dr. Valentine's critique closes with the assertion that "The Manual stands for a special type in present contention." Nothing could possibly be a greater misrepresentation of its position. No one can take such a view of the Manual, except that his standpoint be so extreme that a central position seems distorted to him. If there is one thing that is repugnant to the Manual's ideal, it is a "special type," a narrow phase, an isolated peculiarity. More than all else, these little rallying centres, setting up for the Lutheran Church their narrow partisan shibboleth, and each one then arrayed against the other, have been the bane of our Church's progress in America. The Manual, contrariwise, sets out with the purpose "that it may contribute toward one, great, undivided Evangelical Lutheran Church—that the Ecclesiastical Mother of Protestantism may be for America what she has been and is for the world." And consistently rising above all contracted views and fettering prejudices, the Manual holds true to this purpose from the first page to the last. The author stands on the basis of the General Synod, but he has not written a General Synod, but a "*Lutheran Manual*." Had he set forth what may be the distinctive features of a minority or majority in the General Synod, then indeed his book would have stood for a "special type in present contention." But as the author holds that the General Synod is a part of the great Evangelical Lutheran Church, and bound to mould itself by that generic type, and not the reverse, so in drawing this portrait, he has studied the features of the universal Lutheran Mother. And not until every Lutheran resolves to break away from these "special types," to discard prejudices against other Lutheran bodies, to sacrifice some casual peculiarities that may have become dear to his practice, and to unite on great common features, can that ideal be realized which should be the aim and goal of every loyal heart—one great undivided American Lutheran Church, working out its divinely ordained mission in this western world, and adding a glorious page to the history of the Lutheran Church universal.*

*No man has a larger outlook for the whole Lutheran Church than that

Even ignoring its discourteous tone, this attack of Dr. Valentine upon the "Lutheran Manual" is wholly without justification or excuse. The Manual was not written as a textbook of scientific theology, but as a popular treatise, familiarizing Lutheran distinctive features for the public at large. Yet Dr. Valentine's critique rests upon purely technical grounds. Questions of theological nomenclature, verbal and textual cavils, hair-splitting definitions, points of mere logomachy, such as entirely escape the casual reader, and have not the smallest practical value or interest for him, are exaggerated into mountains of objection. With all the keen scent that Dr. Valentine has evinced for Romanizing tendencies, "sacramentarianism," &c., he is able to find none,—no radical defect—in the Manual. On such vital points, he is even forced, so contrary to the depreciatory tone of his criticism, to make this leading admission: "It is pleasant to be able to recognize and record that the Manual clearly and unqualifiedly maintains the Lutheran and Protestant teaching that '*the word of God is the chief means of grace,*' p. 23. This is repeated with emphasis: 'All Lutherans attach all efficacy of the Sacrament to the word of God.' 'It is therefore the staple of Lutheran preaching and the centre of every Lutheran service.' * * * We take great pleasure in calling attention to

eminent servant of God, Bishop von Scheéle, whose visit last summer was such a blessing to our churches. In a letter to the writer, dated March 20th, 1894, he thus shows how this end lies near his heart: "My first wish is to see the happy beginnings of a reunion of Evangelical Lutheran Bodies in America brought about. We will beseech God our heavenly Father on both sides of the Atlantic to guide this theme to a good end." And how far the Manual strikes this noble Christian as a "campaign missive," or as for a "special type," is shown from these words sent the publishers: After speaking of the Manual's "clear and deep insight into the peculiar character of the Lutheran Church as the historically highest form of Protestant Christianity," he adds among other things this thought: "Besides this, I think the most grateful acknowledgment is due to *the spirit of peace* whose sweet breath meets the reader from every page of the book, nowise, however, tending to flat and superficial unionism, but with the lofty and legitimate purpose of teaching all those who in reality have the same purely scriptural foundation for their faith *to understand and love each other* as true brethren in our Lord Jesus Christ."

this positive and unmistakable representation of the true Lutheran teaching on this important point, especially in view of a recent readiness of some among us to reduce the word from its chief place in the service and as a means of grace." Yet, thus staunch and correct on the great common-places of Lutheran theology, and ever aligning its statements with confessional and individual Lutheran authorities, as much as such a book would allow without destroying its popular usefulness, Dr. Valentine must vehemently assail it as a whole, because, in minute shades, "hardly consistent with exact Lutheran terminology." This process reminds one of the scholastic word-threshers of the Middle Ages who so excited Luther's indignation, or of the Rabbis of Christ's time, or of Nero's frivolity when Rome was burning. When the vital interests of our dear Lutheran Church are at stake, let us not fall to fighting over trivial technicalities. Lutherans need to stand shoulder to shoulder, and to help and encourage every honest effort to advance the common cause. Let us not pull different ways, but pull together. Let us not tear down one another's work, but build upon it, and mutually help each other. United on the main points, let us ignore trifling grounds of difference.

And here a thought naturally comes in which has often occasioned pain to the writer. Our theological seminaries, at great expense, are endowed that we may have theologians skilled and at leisure to defend and champion our Lutheran Church from enemies abroad and hirelings within. Yet, with all the anti-Lutheran writers, and misrepresentations of, and open attacks upon Lutheran doctrines and usages, with which some of our journals have teemed for years, Dr. Valentine has never uttered a word or written a line in censure of them. But the moment an over-worked pastor rises to say a word in favor of Lutheranism, and dares to stand up stoutly for his Church, and seeks to hold her up to honor, then Dr. Valentine sallies forth like an armed Achilles to strike him down. Romanism, Sacramentarianism, Ritualism, Form of Concord-ism, &c., are then the rallying cries raised against him. Gov. Dix's famous order ran: "If you see any one pulling down the American flag, shoot him down on

the spot." But here the order seems to run: "If you see any one throwing missiles at the Lutheran banner, call him to the front, but if you see any one whose enthusiasm so far runs away with him that he raises aloft the Lutheran standard and unfurls its glorious colors to the breeze, aim your guns at him at once." The point here suggested is of far-reaching significance, and one that every Lutheran pastor and layman will do well to ponder.

The author may frankly say that the *Lutheran Manual* was not expected to please Dr. Valentine. Its standpoint and his are too radically divergent. The Manual stands for positive and progressive, not for negative and apologetic Lutheranism; the Manual stands for distinct and uniform Lutheran usages, not for non-distinct, promiscuous and conflicting usages; the Manual stands for historical Lutheranism, not for a dwarfed "*American Lutheranism*," American Protestantism being predominantly Zwinglian and Calvinistic; the Manual faces away from the other denominations, and toward fellow-Lutherans, not toward the other denominations and away from fellow-Lutherans; the Manual stands for lessening and ignoring divisions between Lutheran brethren, not for widening and emphasizing them; the Manual stands for a Lutheran historical order and for but one Service Book for all the English-speaking bodies in the United States,* not for two books in but one small body; the Manual stands for Lutheran unity, strength and greatness, not for Lutheran particularity, feebleness and littleness; the Manual stands for one universal Lutheran Church of fifty millions, not for a "special type" in the

*As a remarkable instance of Dr. Valentine's blundering and vacillation respecting the Common Service, in the October QUARTERLY of 1886 he asserts that "the General Synod took the lead in the suggestion and adoption of this work," "in the interest of unity and uniformity." Whereas, the Common Service originated in the General Synod South, and the General Synod (North) was the last of the three bodies to adopt it. And what Dr. V. then so earnestly advocated as "in the interest of unity and uniformity," (as he also did at Omaha) he now strongly disfavors. If such historical blundering and vacillation characterize the history which Dr. V. proposes to write of the General Synod—as a General Synod College President lately remarked to the writer—"another and reliable one will have to be written, that is all."

General Synod, a Lutheran sect of but a few thousands. The positions of the Manual and its critic being thus antipodal, the Manual of course could not expect Dr. Valentine's approval. A manual that he would approve, would not meet the Church's approval. And such a Manual, too, the Lutheran Church does not need. Nor would its colorless, nerveless character affect the Church one way or the other. If the Manual is of the heroic Lutheran temper, it responds to the demands of the time, and meets the issues of the hour.

A final word. The preparation of the Lutheran Manual was almost beyond the author's time and strength. Its reception has been beyond all expectation. As says Vol. iv., p. 517 of the American Church History Series, it is being "widely circulated without distinction of inter-ecclesiastical lines." The American Lutheran Church unquestionably accepts it as, on the whole, a correct and judicious epitome of her faith and usages. Every criticism, no matter in what spirit presented, will be carefully weighed in the issue of subsequent editions. No effort will be spared to make it a thoroughly representative book. But the author, overburdened with the labors of a metropolitan pastorate, cannot engage in controversy respecting it. Consequently, any further attack will be unnoticed. Happily, the Lutheran Manual needs no defence. It can and will take care of itself.*

*The publishers write that the April QUARTERLY attack has sensibly quickened the demand for the Manual.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION OF WORD AND SACRAMENTS AS MEANS
OF GRACE IN THE LUTHERAN SYSTEM.*

By PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

Words dropped from time to time, public deliverances made, questions asked, statements occurring in the Church papers,—these and other intimations have combined to create the impression that there is, to put it mildly, at least a tendency among us, to depart from the historical teaching of the Lutheran Church on the relation of word and sacraments as means of grace. The evident existence of such a tendency has led the writer to inquire earnestly for the teaching of the Church as set forth in the writings of her standard theologians and in her official declarations. The result of the inquiry is now laid before the readers of the QUARTERLY, with the hope that it may lead to a clearer apprehension of a doctrine which the Lutheran Church has ever held as one of her brightest jewels, viz., the doctrine of the means of grace.

But in setting forth the relation of word and sacraments as means of grace in the Lutheran System, three things must be premised as fundamental:

1. The word is constitutive factor for the sacraments.
2. The word and sacraments as means offer and convey grace.
3. The grace offered and conveyed by word and sacraments is the same.

We believe that these three propositions will be accepted without dispute by all sound Lutherans. In the very beginning, the Lutheran Reformers adopted the Augustinian maxim: "When the word is added to the element, a sacrament is formed."

*With the exception of three footnotes and an occasional verbal emendation this article was prepared, just as it appears in print, before the writer had even seen the article entitled "*Coördination of Word and Sacrament*" in the April No. of the QUARTERLY. Nor is there anything in that article which of itself could have been the occasion of this one. J. W. R.

It is a common and universal teaching of our Church that grace is offered and conveyed by means of the divine word, and by means of certain divinely instituted signs, or ceremonies, called sacraments. It is a confessional deliverance of the Church that the grace offered and conveyed by these means, is identical, for the reason that there is only one grace, viz., the grace of forgiveness, as there is only one salvation.

But the fact that the word is constitutive factor for the sacraments, that word and sacraments are means of grace, and that they offer and convey grace, does not preclude either the idea or the fact of operative and relational differences *inter se*. It does not require an elaborate argument to show that word and sacraments do not, in the Scriptures, stand on a plane of coördination, in the sense that they are identical in order, fulness, compass, and method of operation. It goes almost with the saying that in the Book itself, a primacy and a supremacy are given to the word, which cannot be ascribed to the sacraments. The word is spirit and life; the power of God; an incorruptible seed. It illuminates, regenerates, sanctifies, overcomes the world. In the Old Testament the word and the prophetic deliverance of the word, signalize every step of progress in the preparation for the coming of Christ. Our divine Redeemer not only gave the word, but he preached the word for three years before he instituted the sacraments. This action of his is absolutely normative for the Church, viz., that the word must be preached, and must be allowed to produce spiritual effects, before the sacraments can be administered. This is *primacy*, not only in the sense of chronological precedence, but in the sense of importance; for this word was absolutely necessary to prepare the way for the institution of the sacraments, and did actually produce *faith* in Christ, a *faith which saved*. Then too it was by the word that Christ resisted Satan, by the word that he assembled his disciples, and essentially by the word that he wrought his miracles. He entrusted the Seventy with the word. He sent out the Twelve with the commission to teach and to preach the word, as their chief apostolic function (Matt. 28 : 19, 20 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 17), and he makes the coming of the kingdom of

heaven dependent upon sowing "the seed which is the word of God" (Luke 8 : 11). The apostle joins *faith* with *hearing*, and hearing with the word of God (Rom. 10 : 17), and makes aptness to teach the chief ministerial qualification.

Thus we see that it has pleased the Redeemer to employ the word as the great chief-essential means for conveying his grace, that is, himself to men. He is the Word, the incarnated truth and wisdom of the Father. As he laid hold on human nature, so has he laid hold on human speech, the most widely used means of intellectual and spiritual intercourse, as the most appropriate instrument for communicating that truth which is itself the power of God unto salvation. If other means be used for the attainment of the same end, still these cannot dispute the primary and all-comprehending position of the word. Hence if in Lutheran theology all the means of grace be sometimes designated as *word*, or *gospel*, it is because of the generic, all-achieving, all-embracing, unifying character of the word. Only a perverted and Romanizing Lutheranism could reverse this order and designate all the means of grace as *sacrament*,—a name nowhere employed in the New Testament to designate baptism or the Lord's Supper. Thus the sacrament, the *specific*, is subsumed under the word, the *generic*. The species never can be equal in compass, fullness and range of efficiency with the genus. Nay, more: the word under all circumstances is the word, an independent entity; but without the word the sacraments *do not* and *can not exist*; that is, the word has an independent existence, and if an independent existence, then an independent and immediate operation. But the sacraments, dependent in existence (see first premise), are also dependent and mediate in operation; that is, the sacraments can not have any power except that which is imparted to them by and through the word.*

*It is a Lutheran common-place that the authority and efficacy of the word are intrinsic and *extra usum*. No such distinction belongs to a sacrament, since not even the *verbum accedit ad elementum* in the consecration, completes the sacrament. "With all emphasis has the Lutheran Church declared that the recitation of the New Testament words *per se alone* do not make a sacrament, but only in connection with the *whole act*

Also the word is constant in its operation. The sacrament of baptism is administered once in a life-time, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, at intervals. The recollection of our baptism is chiefly a recollection of the word; and the word and the preaching of the word are required to prepare for and to sustain the grace offered and conveyed at intervals by the Lord's Supper. As rites, signs, ceremonies, the chief office of the sacraments, according to Lutheran teaching, is to witness and seal the grace already given, and to specialize that grace to the individual believer by the words: "I baptize thee." "Take, eat." "Drink." But even this specialization of grace is not peculiar to the sacraments. It belongs also to the so-called Absolution, or Declaration of grace, to pastoral instruction, yea, even to preaching to specialize grace to the individual. Philip through the word specialized grace to the eunuch when he "preached unto him Jesus," and Paul addressed the gospel specially to the Jailer, when he said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." We say: "The Almighty and most merciful God hath had mercy upon thee, and by virtue of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, his dear Son, forgives thee all thy sins." The very same specialization is involved in the doctrine of the Keys. Well does Dr. Achelis say: "Because the heart of the Gospel is forgiveness of sins, wherever the gospel is preached, publicly or privately, there is absolution. It is imparted in Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but especially *in every Christian sermon*. 'Baptism, Absolution, preaching and sacrament shall not be despised, but forgiveness of sin shall be sought therein. Thou hearest the gospel daily, what is this but the word of absolution? To preach the gospel is nothing else than to absolve and declare free from sins.' " (*Prakt. Theol.* I., p. 66). And the entire Wittenberg faculty put itself on record in 1536 in almost the same language to the effect that in public preach-

of institution of the Lord's Supper, hence not *extra usum*, that is, apart from the distribution and oral reception of the consecrated bread and wine." Bachmann, *Der Lit. Aufbau*, p. 29.

ing come forgiveness of sin and comfort to the heart of the believer (*De Wette's Luther's Briefe*. VI., p. 177).

What is this preaching but specialization of grace? and certainly this specialization of grace addressed to the ear by the *word*, cannot be less potent than the specialization of grace addressed to the eye through the *sacrament*. Indeed, whether means of grace be addressed to the eye or to the ear, can make no essential difference, since in either case the grace approaches mind and heart through the senses, and the grace itself, according to our third fundamental premise, is the same. No higher grace, no transcendent gift *can* be conveyed by the sacrament. Hence we perfectly agree with our old Dogmaticians when they assert the essential unity and equality of gifts conveyed by word and sacrament. Christ is not divided, is not divisible. He is whole and entire. That he imparts himself through the word, no sound Lutheran would deny. The only absolute need in order to be saved is that we receive and appropriate Christ. Who will say that this cannot be done fully and perfectly through the instrumentality of the word? In view of 1 Pet. 1 : 23—"being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God,"—who will say that regeneration is ascribed to the word any less than to baptism? "And in view of John 6th, who would affirm that the believer receives the body and blood of Christ only through the Lord's Supper, and not also through the word and through faith?"* Yea, does not even the Form of Concord declare that "there is a partaking of the flesh of Christ, which is effected by the Holy Spirit and by faith in the preaching and in the meditation on the gospel, even as the same is effected in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper," and does it not also say that "this spiritual eating is necessary to all Christians, at all times, for salvation," that is, *absolutely* necessary; and also indispensably necessary to a salutary sacramental eating? Yea, more, does not this same Form of Concord say: "This spiritual eating is nothing else but *faith*, that is to hear the word of God, (in which is offered unto us Christ—true

*Buchrucker: *Grundlinien der Katechetik*.

God and man,—with all the blessings which he obtained for us with his body given unto death for us, and with his blood shed for us—namely, the grace of God, remission of sins, righteousness and eternal life) to embrace the same by faith, to apply it to ourselves, to rely firmly and with perfect confidence and assurance upon this consolation that we have a gracious God and eternal life for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to support ourselves by it in every time of need and in all temptations?" Nowhere in the entire volume of our symbolical books, is so wide a range of efficiency ascribed to the "sacramental eating" as is here ascribed to this "spiritual eating," this "hearing the word of God." Hence the dictum of the old Dogmaticians of the essential unity and equality of the gifts of word and sacrament, is based upon the generic quality of the word, which, because it is *generic*, and not *specific*, because it regenerates, offers the full Christ—true God and man—comforts and supports in every time of need, and achieves all things in the realm of grace, has, both in the Scriptures and in the Lutheran System, higher names and more generous prerogatives ascribed to it than are ascribed to the sacraments.

According to the Lutheran System the sacraments *do indeed offer and convey grace*. But as we have already seen, they offer and convey it *mediately* through the word, which is not only constitutive for them, but which must *precede, attend and follow* them, as witness the baptism of the eunuch and that of the Jailer, and as witness all Lutheran celebrations of the Holy Supper. Hence, to repeat, the sacraments are dependent, not only in their constitution, but in their operation. They not only presuppose the word, but they presuppose the operation of the word. Even to infants baptism can be rightly administered only where the word has wrought or is supposed to have wrought, justifying faith in the parents or sponsors; and the grace imparted to infants in baptism can be brought to consciousness only through the teaching and preaching of the word. That is, provision for the subsequent preaching and teaching of the divine word (bringing up in the faith) is the necessary presupposition for infant baptism; otherwise, as a great Lutheran

theologian says, children "are baptized" and "turned over to heathendom." The Lord's Supper is never administered for the purpose of begetting faith *ab initio*, but for the purpose of confirming and sealing the justifying faith already wrought by the word. But justifying faith is the central principle in the Lutheran System. He who has this faith has everything, because he has Christ "with all the blessings which he obtained for us with his body given unto death for us, and with his blood shed for us." But as this faith is wrought by the Spirit through the word—"spiritual eating"—"hearing the word"—it follows that the sacramental office and power to confirm this faith and to seal the grace of spiritual eating, is supplemental and auxiliary. Hence the person who has this justifying faith, who has done this "spiritual eating," does not *indispensably* need the sacraments. That is, sacraments are not *absolutely* necessary to salvation. "A person can be saved without the sacrament, but not without the word," is an established maxim in the Lutheran System, from the pen of Luther himself. This at once sweeps from the sacraments the dignity and place of coördination with the word as means of grace. It also foreshadows the position of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the service of public worship.

Moreover: Among the most sacred canons of the Lutheran System are the following, also from the pen of Luther: "Where the word of God is, there is Christ." "A Christian should know that on earth there is no greater sanctity than the word of God; for even the sacrament itself is made, blessed and hallowed by the word of God, and by it also are we all born spiritually and consecrated to be Christians. Hence the *word*, which hallows all things, is *superior* (*höher*) to the *sacrament*." "God will give the Spirit to no one without the word and the office of preaching, which he appointed solely to preach Christ." "Faith cometh by preaching, and preaching by the word of God." Joining on to these canons, and especially to the last one, the standard Lutheran theologians have always emphasized the paramount importance of preaching the word for the production of justifying faith. On this point Höfling, von Hofmann, von

Zezschwitz, Zöckler, Buchrucker, Luthardt, Frank, and Thomasius, among the moderns, have been specially emphatic, alike pointing to and basing their conclusions on Rom. 10:15-17. The last named, in expounding the "Lutheran Confession in the Consequence of its Principle," says: "Justifying faith has its most immediate object in the word of the Gospel, for it is essentially faith in the promise of grace, in the testimony of God's grace, in the preaching of Christ. But this object is likewise *its principle*; for through it justifying faith arises in the heart. The word has called and enlightened the justified person. On the one hand it awoke in him the knowledge of sin and of the need of salvation, and trust in the Saviour. If external experiences and special circumstances have contributed to these ends, yet always it was the *word preached and heard* which moved him to appropriate redemption by faith," (p. 25). In proof of this position he appeals to the experience of the Christian, who is distinctly conscious of the influence of the word alone; which agrees with Rom. 10:17. This word is not only a divine word; it has a divine power, a creative energy. It operates upon the deepest principles of a man's life. As law it works contrition, which according to the Lutheran System is one part of faith. As gospel it works confidence, *fiducia personalis*. Here we have, in complex, justifying faith. This is the Lutheran central principle. But the principle of this principle is the *word preached and heard*. It is in harmony with the Christian consciousness and with Rom. 10:17, that the word alone moves to the appropriation of Christ. Herein does the sacrament as means fail to measure up to the fulness of coördination with the word: The word of and embraced by the sacrament are the words of institution. They are gospel in the strictest sense of the term. They do not contain any law. They cannot work that necessary antecedent part of faith, known as contrition. Hence the sacrament must *per necessitatem* confine its operation to quickening and confirming the faith wrought by the *word preached and heard*. This is a high and noble office, and fully vindicates to the sacrament the right to be called a means of grace. But a higher office is that of the word, which, Thomasius declares, is

the organ and instrument of the Spirit in producing both faith and regeneration. And none the less decided is this great theologian of our Church in vindicating the superior place to the word, when he proceeds to indicate specifically both the points of agreement and the points of difference between word and sacraments as means of grace, declaring that "neither renders the other superfluous, and that each finds in the other its necessary supplement. Without the word the sacrament would be a dumb enigma. Without the operation of the word in creating faith, the relation into which baptism brings man, remains purely an objective one, and the gift which it puts into his heart remains a treasure hid in a field. Without the appropriating personal faith, despite baptism and the Lord's Supper, there results no fellowship of salvation with Christ, no personal justification; and the sacramental mediation of grace is gradually withdrawn without being able to unfold its blessings, or it finally becomes a judgment upon the recipient. Hence the word holds the chief place in the economy of salvation, for in faith lies the decision for salvation. If any one be deprived of the sacrament without his own fault, he can be saved in some way by grace through faith alone" (*Person u. Werk Christi*; p. 358).

All this and much more is said by Thomasius, not for the purpose of favoring a Zwinglian conception of the sacraments, as might now be charged, had the explanations given above been written by one less illustriously Lutheran, but for the purpose of setting the different means of grace in their right relations "according to the Scriptures." Attention may very properly be called to the assertion of the absolute dependence of the sacraments upon the word—"a dumb enigma"—by which "word" is to be understood not only "the word added to the element," that is, the word of institution, but the meaning is that without the body and content of divine teaching, the sacraments would be absolutely unintelligible—"a dumb enigma," and absolutely unavailing—"a treasure hid in a field." Of themselves, without the word and the faith begotten through the word, they can produce "no fellowship of salvation with Christ, no personal justification." Their "mediation of grace is withdrawn," or "be-

comes a judgment upon the recipient." A more emphatic vindication of the chief place for the word in the economy of salvation could hardly have been expressed in human speech. Such we conceive to be the entire standard teaching on the relation of word and sacraments as means of grace in the Lutheran System. That we may make this more completely objective, we lay down the following Thesis:

In the Lutheran System the word occupies the CHIEF OR LEADING, the PREEMINENT place as means of grace; and preaching as the chief method of applying the grace of the means, occupies the CENTRAL CONTROLLING place in congregational worship.

This Thesis, which is two-fold in character, it is not desirable to separate, since the means of grace and the application of the grace of the means, are intimately related. We proceed to illustrate it as it stands, though a particular illustration may throw more light upon one member than upon the other. Only standard teachers and official documents will be allowed to speak, the emphasis indicated by italics being that of the authors quoted.

THE REFORMERS.

Luther. In the eighth of the Marburg Articles Luther wrote: "That the Holy Ghost, to speak in proper order, gives this faith or his gift to no one without preaching, or the oral word, or the gospel of Christ preceding, but by and with this oral word, works and furnishes faith, as and in whom he will, Rom. 10:17." This declaration was signed by six of the original Lutheran Reformers. In the most absolute and exclusive way the article connects the *working and furnishing* of faith with preaching, or the oral word. The corresponding article in the Schwabach series, prepared by Luther and his associates, in language almost identical with that given above, exalts "the oral word" as means of grace. In the following article, the sacraments are mentioned in a way that clearly indicates *auxiliary or supplementary* relation.

In his German Mass (1526) Luther says: "The chief and most important part in every divine service is the preaching and teaching of God's word." In a writing vindicating to the con-

gregation the right to judge doctrine, and to call teachers, he says: "The preaching office is the highest of all; on it depend all others. Where the preaching office does not exist, no one of the others follows; for John says, 4 : 2, that Christ did not baptize, but only preached. And Paul, 1 Cor. 1 : 17, boasts that he was sent not to baptize, but to preach.

"Hence upon whom the preaching office is conferred, upon him is conferred the highest office in the Christian Church. He may also baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, and discharge all pastoral duties, or if he does not thus wish, he may abide in preaching alone, and leave to others baptism and other subordinate duties, as Christ did, and Paul and all the apostles, Acts 6," (*Erl. Ed.* 22, 151).*

It is easy to see how Luther here exalts preaching, and *subordinates* the sacraments. He distinctly says that the latter belong to the *subordinate* duties of the ministry. Preaching is in so far a minister's *chief* work that he may abide in that alone. In defence of this position he refers to the example of Christ and the apostles, and both here and in the Babylonish Captivity, he appeals to the "boast" of Paul in 1 Cor. 1 : 17. It is "the highest office of the word," and "the word of faith" (which works faith) that Luther exalts. And because "the word of faith" is the one thing *absolutely* essential, he sees in preaching the most exalted worship, and hence says in the Preface to his Lectures on the Psalms of Degrees: "The faithful preaching of the word of God is the more proper worship (*proprius cultus*) in the New Testament, far more acceptable to God, holier and better than all the services and all the sacrifices of the Old Testament," (*Erl. Lat.* 19 : 161). Pages of exactly similar import could easily be quoted. One has only to read Luther's doctrine of the *absolute* necessity of faith both for salvation and for a

*In commenting on Ps. 68 : 26, Luther writes: "Thus we see that more stress is laid on preaching than on the Lord's Supper; for the prophet here teaches that in the congregation preaching is the praise of God, and nothing is said about the Lord's Supper, unless it be implied in the word congregation, for the Lord's Supper has no value in a crowd without the word of God" (*Erl. Ed.* 39, 209).

salutary reception of the sacraments, and to observe how he associates the genesis of faith with the word, and to discover how he denies the absolute necessity of the sacraments, to see that he makes the latter secondary in relation and conditioned in operation. Says Thomasius: "To Luther is the *word* the primary means of grace. It also conditions the nature and operation of the *sacraments*, for without the word they would be nothing but 'a mere hull,' 'like a body without a soul,' 'a letter without a spirit,' 'a scabbard without a blade,'" (*Person u. W.*, II., 241). And Dorner, whose opinion on all matters of doctrinal history is of great weight: "Luther connects faith principally with the word (mediately also with the sacraments") (*Prot. Theol.*, I., p. 149). And Jacoby, who describes Luther's doctrine of the means of grace thus: "The valuable, the indispensable is the word; the dispensable and subordinate is the sacrament. 'The words are divine pledges, a promise, and testament. The sacraments are signs, that is a holy sign. Now as there is much more in the testament than in the sacrament, so is there much more in the words than in the signs.'" And again: "The promise has absolute, indispensable value, the sign relative, dispensable value. * * The sacramental sign, though real, remains a sign, and can have only a relative necessity." *Liturgik*, I., 180, 199.

Equally decisive is the opinion of other commentators on Luther's doctrine of the means of grace. The emphasis is always laid on the word as the superior means. The word is testament, witness, promise, message. The sacrament is sign and seal, "and can have only a relative necessity."

Melanchthon and *Bugenhagen*. Passages from these associates of Luther lie before us, but they are too long to quote. They may be found in Dr. Plitt's *Einleitung in die Augustana*, II., p. 183, where he discusses "the doctrine of the word as means of grace." They connect faith, penitence and the Holy Ghost *immediately* with the preaching of the word and are in full harmony with Dr. Plitt's statement (p. 165) of Luther's doc-

trine of the means of grace :* "God draws nigh to man always in the word, and never without the word. Hence even in the sacraments the most essential thing is the word of divine promise. But that word presupposes faith in the hearer." Thus it is the word, and the preaching of the word, independent of and above the sacraments, and the word in the sacraments, that is exalted as means of grace by the Reformers, whose "*conception of the spiritual office is essentially that of a service in the word,*" and whose "chief sword in the new spiritual conflict was the *preaching of the divine word*" (*Dr. Christlieb in Herzog*, XVIII., 515-6). Hence : "The preaching of the word was made the central point of the whole public service" (*Kurtz, Ch. Hist.*, II., 364).

THE CONFESSIONS.

We may agree with Dr. Schmid : "The Symbolical Books do not express themselves distinctly on the efficacy of the word of God" (*Dogmatik*, p. 519); and with Dr. Plitt : "No definition of sacrament in the strict sense occurs in the Confession" (*Symbolik*, p. 63). Yet he has read the Symbolical Books very unprofitably who has not discovered the prominence given in them to the word of God, whenever either the formal or the material principle is brought into view. It is their implied and expressed teaching that only the divine word can make articles of faith, the faith which is believed. And the faith which believes is inseparably connected with the preaching and hearing of the same divine word. Hence Guericke, "a high-Church Lutheran," in treating of the word as exhibited in the Symbols, both as formal

*Still more distinctly has Dr. Plitt brought out Luther's view of the word as *chief* means of grace in Vol. I., p. 151: "In his gracious operation upon the spirit of man God uses external means, which he has appointed, and which he does not omit. The chief means (Hauptmittel) by which he draws nigh to man is the word which condemns sin and offers grace. The word he requires to be preached, and demands faith in it as the all-decisive thing. Yet it is not the person, who, when he hears the word, of himself presents himself with faith. But when the word is preached God works faith by the Spirit who speaks in the word. Hence where the word is preached, there God reveals himself, there is fellowship with God, there is the Church."

principle and as means of grace, declares that it is "primary," and that it "stands on the summit of the Confessions, and furnishes the ground of all their discussions," (*Symbolik*, pp. 426, 204). The same position of primacy is accorded to the word indirectly when the Apology describes the sacraments as "rites," "signs of promises," "a picture or seal of the word." Or as Dr. Plitt puts it: "Signs and seals of the word." Here the very language of the Apology excludes the thought of coördination, for the sign of a promise, the seal of a word, cannot be of equal value with the promise and the word. Such language also excludes the thought of an additional gift, for according to reiterated Lutheran teaching the gift is contained already in the word, in the promises. The sacrament pictures it to the eye, or seals it to already existing faith. But the principal, the essential thing is the promise, which, again according to Lutheran teaching, is not necessarily vacated or annulled through the absence of the seal, but is supplemented and specialized by its application.

Hence it is entirely contrary to Lutheran symbolical teaching to say, as has been said in certain quarters, that the word only communicates a *knowledge* of salvation, and the sacraments communicate its *possession*. The word and sacraments are related to the *possession* of the one salvation, the one divine fellowship in Christ, the word *directly* and *immediately*, the sacraments indirectly and mediately. In the fulness of the divine provision for the appropriation of redemption, the two normally go together, and properly fall under the same generic idea and title of means of grace, and have the ascended Redeemer as their inworking principle and salvation as their end, but manifestly, as all along we have seen, in a different relation and according to a divinely appointed order. Such relation and order are not dimly hinted at in the Confessions.

The Augustana. In the fifth article it is said: "God has instituted the office of preaching, and given the gospel and the sacraments, through which as means, he imparts the Holy Spirit." Here it is said that God has instituted the "office of preaching" (*Predigtamt*). This is the genus, and at once marks the chief work of the minister, and indicates the chief means by

which the Holy Ghost is imparted, which is further indicated by the Article's condemnation of the Anabaptists, who imagine that the Holy Ghost is given "without the external word of the Gospel." The administration of the sacraments is subsumed as species, and is always made dependent upon preaching. And very remarkable is it that in the article the word of God should have been mentioned four times, and "sacraments" only once. This cannot be looked upon as an accidental occurrence, but as clearly indicating, in harmony with the well-known position of the Reformers (see Visitation Articles, *Corp. Ref.*, XXVI., 71) as often expressed, that the superior place is to be accorded to the word as means of grace. The comment of Prof. Zöckler, a confessional Lutheran, on our article, will not be charged with Zwinglianism: "That the sacraments should be mentioned in this relation together with the word or gospel involves an irenic-conservative tendency and Catholic attitude, which go beyond the statements of Scripture, which names the word or the preaching of the same as the source (*Quelle*) of saving faith (Rom. 1 : 16; 10 : 17; Gal. 3 : 2; 2 Cor. 3 : 8), and also beyond the declarations of the corresponding Marburg and Schwabach articles [see above] which make no mention of the sacraments. But this co-mentioning of the sacraments cannot be regarded as unevangelical, for the making mention of the word twice already points to their subordinate importance in comparison with this chief means of grace (Hauptgnadenmittel), and still more distinctly is this shown when in a third and fourth reference to the divine origination of faith the word alone is named"** (*Augsburg Confession*, p. 191). It will be observed that Dr. Zöckler calls attention to the fact more than once

*Here Zöckler agrees perfectly with the almost unanimous teaching of our modern Lutheran divines, as that teaching is voiced by Thomäsius: "Faith has its *causa efficiens* in the word, but the word always imparts itself to the human spirit through hearing ('faith cometh by hearing, but hearing by the word of God,' Rom. 10 : 14-17)." (*Person u. W.*, II., p. 381). To this may be added what he says on p. 500: "Even baptism, where faith is entirely wanting, does not yet make a person a member of Christ, and consequently also not yet a member of his body. In such an event it only puts into a one-sided and external relation to both."

already intimated in this paper as the Lutheran teaching, that "the divine origination of faith" is connected with the word and the preaching of the same. Like it or dislike it as we may, it is nowhere said in the New Testament that the instrumental cause or source (*Quelle*) of faith is a sacrament. It is the unchallenged teaching of the New Testament that when the word and the preaching of the word have preceded and begotten faith, the sacraments are to be administered and received, as seals and confirmation of the faith, in which administration and reception, they become means of grace and carry with them the Holy Ghost. It is in this relation that Zöckler understands the teaching of the article, and hence names the word "the chief means of grace," and the sacraments as "of subordinate importance," in which he is fully sustained by Carpzov, the most rigidly orthodox of the interpreters of the Confession, who in his exposition of the article says: "*Teaching the Gospel:* Two things are indicated by these words: *The more important function* of the ministry, to which all others are subservient, for there are many other duties of the ministry. * * Our fathers wished to indicate *certainly the more important part of the ministry*, viz., the preaching of the Gospel," because, he says, "the inquiry here is in regard to the origination of faith, which is produced by the gospel, the law preceding or following." Thus Carpzov declares that the Confession associates the most important ministerial function with that means through which faith is originated. This can be explained only on the ground that the gospel is assumed to be the most important means of grace.

Apology. We have room for but a single quotation. "Among our adversaries there is no preaching in many countries during the whole year, except only in Lent. This gives them just cause for loud complaint, for this is at once subverting all divine worship. The most eminent, holy, useful and exalted service which God has required in the first and second commandments is the preaching of his word, for the office of the preacher is the highest in the Church. How then can the knowledge of God, the doctrine of Christ, or the Gospel prevail where this service is omitted?" (p. 274). Comment is unnecessary. The reader

has not failed to observe the eminent harmony which exists between this teaching of Melanchthon, and the evident meaning of the fifth article of the Confession.

Schmalkald Articles. The reader is invited to see how "the oral word" is exalted in this important confessional book, by turning to Part. III., sections ix., viii.

And now turning from the Confessions themselves we present a comment of one whose name will at this time carry great weight.

Von Scheele. Bishop von Scheele is not only a distinguished prelate in the Lutheran Church, but also a sound and learned theologian. He wrote the section on Symbolics for Zöckler's "Handbook of the Theological Sciences." His treatment of the means of grace is *wholly* from the standpoint of the Confessions, in which, he says, "the means of grace are more strongly insisted on than in the Scripture." He gives a reason for this: "For Protestantism there is special need of exalting the means of grace, particularly the word of God, in order to maintain a counterpoise against Catholicism, which proclaims the ecclesiastical hierarchy as the mediator of grace." Then after exhibiting the relation of the fifth article of the Confession to justification, he proceeds to give the Lutheran *confessional* teaching of the means of grace in antithesis to the Roman Catholic conception: "The *word* is the most essential and most proper means of grace (Das *Wort* ist das hauptsächlichste und eigentlichste gnadenmittel) from which every other receives its particular character. As it does not receive its high significance and destination primarily from the Church, so it is not the witness of the Church which primarily vouched for and guaranteed this significance. Much rather does the word approve itself immediately to the conscience of every one who opens himself to it, as the real and true word of God. From the Church we do indeed receive the first important and valuable reference to it as the clear source of the higher life, and of all genuine and sure thoughts about eternity. But it is from Christ himself that we receive the internal proof and assurance of this. And this is true not only of the original documents of the Holy Scriptures,

but also of the oral or written sermon which is based upon and drawn from them, and which in a derivative sense must also be recognized as means of grace. The power of the sermon and of the word to communicate grace to man depends upon God. Hence the word of God is full of Spirit and of life, a seed of regeneration, a power unto salvation to all who believe. The Spirit works through the word not only by means of reflection, but much rather is the Spirit of God personally present in the word, and adapts it to the various circumstances of each individual. The word consist of Law and Gospel, which as arising from one and the same Spirit give expression to the one and same divine will, which both condemns sin and forgives sin. The law and the gospel are so united that the gospel gives what the law demands.

The *sacraments* are described as signs and seals of the word of God, the number of which is determined from the Scriptures, not according to human ordinances and usages," Vol. II., pp. 756-7).

The superior emphasis which the good bishop lays on the word as means of grace, in expounding the confessional teaching of the Church, has certainly made its impression on the reader. A better illustration of our Thesis could hardly have been found in the whole range of theological literature. It is the opinion of one who combines the science of the theologian with the experience of the pastor. It is bishop von Scheéle's judgment that in the Confessions the *word* is the most essential means of grace, and gives character to the other means. The sacraments are signs and seals of the promise, and the promise is always greater than that which seals it. Coördination as *means* is thus out of the question.

Equally clear and distinct in stating the *confessional* teaching of our Church on this subject, is Kollner, whose *Symbolik* is of highest authority: "The word is the chief means (Hauptmittel) for conversion, and hence for the appropriation of salvation. Through it the Holy Ghost not only works regeneration and sanctification, but it abides even after regeneration," I., 664. This and much more he says before he comes to treat of the

sacraments, whose efficiency he makes conditional upon faith in the word of promise: "The power rests upon the word of God, and becomes efficacious through the faith of the recipient," p. 668.

THE DOGMATICIANS.

The *Dogmatik* of the Church claims to be in harmony with the Confessions, and to be a systematized development of their teaching. What light does it throw on our Thesis? Gerhard teaches: "*The primary duty of ministers is the preaching of the word.*" This is proved 1) by express commands to the apostles and to their successors in office: '*Go teach all nations,*' Matt. 28:19; '*Go into all the world and preach the Gospel,*' Mark, 16:15. 2) Names: *Teachers*: *pastors*, to feed the flock with heavenly doctrine; *angels of the Lord, ambassadors of God*, to set forth the will of God by preaching the divine word; *workman*, because they labor in the word. 3) *The Apostolic rule*, a bishop must be apt to teach. 4) *The end*. The Church is gathered by preaching the word. 5) *Distinction between ministers and other officers*—they use the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. 6) *The practice of Christ, of the apostles and bishops of the primitive Church*" (*Loci, XIII.*, 87). These and additional points are illustrated from Scripture and history through three columns, in which there is absolutely no allusion to sacraments. The object of the author is to set forth the *primary duty of ministers*. He connects that duty with the preaching of the word. The whole argument utterly forbids the thought of mere chronological precedence. It is primacy in the sense of importance. Otherwise, "*the practice of Christ, the apostles, and bishops in the primitive Church,*" would not have been introduced. This perfectly agrees with the statement of Baier, when treating of LAW AND GOSPEL: "The word of God is to be regarded especially (peculiariter) as the instrument for kindling the saving faith which is in Christ" (*Compend.* p. 479). And with Hollaz, "who recapitulates with great clearness and compactness the results attained by his predecessors" (Hay and Jacobs). Writing of the word as means of grace, Schmid says: "Hollazius thus sums up the doctrine: 'The word of God

is the most efficacious means of salvation, for its power and efficacy are not only objective, but also effective; not consisting in moral suasion, but in supernatural operation; not external and coming to it when used by man, but intrinsic in the word; not accidental, but necessary by a divinely ordained necessity, and therefore not separable, but perpetual, inherent in the word itself" (*Dogmatik*, p. 523). This and very much more is said by Hollazius in answer to the question: "Is the word an efficacious means of salvation?" As a *summing up* of the teaching of his predecessors, these few sentences from Hollazius deal a death-blow to a theory of the means of grace put forth among us not long ago, in imitation of certain trans-Atlantic Romanizing and Puseyiting conceptions, according to which the word only announces salvation, but the sacraments apply it. According to this *summing up*, the Dogmaticians at least regarded "the word as the most efficacious means of grace," and as endowed with a power of supernatural operation, intrinsic, perpetual, inherent in the word, a means of operation by which God brings sinners to salvation. It lacks no quality of efficiency in the hand of God. It can do all things in the realm of grace.

Well may Meusel say: "Our Lutheran Dogmaticians are in so far right when they ascribe to the word as means of grace, a distinct prerogative over the sacraments as means of grace, which without the word cannot exist," (*Hand-Lexikon*, No. 21, 7). And Luthardt in support of his own thesis that the preached word is the most important means of grace, quotes Quenstedt, Baier and Hollazius. The passage from the former ascribes a divine, supernatural efficiency to the word (the oral word, says Luthardt) in converting, regenerating and renewing. From the old Dogmaticians we turn to their modern and living successors, who, joining on to the old masters, have expounded the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace in opposition to a pseudo-Lutheranism.

Luthardt. Dr. Luthardt is senior of the Leipzig theological faculty, a confessionalist and a great preacher. He discusses "The Word of God" as means of grace under the following the-

sis: "The chief means of grace in the Church is the word of preaching, which through its witness of sin (law) and of grace (gospel) is fitted to work penitent obedience of faith, and to serve the Holy Ghost to that end in proportion as it is a true expression of the salvation of Christ, that is, is scriptural" (*Dogmatik*, p. 322). This thesis is established and illustrated by the author by showing that the facts of salvation are clothed in the word of apostolic preaching, that Christ designated preaching as the calling of the apostles, that "preaching is the first work of the newly-founded Church. It is more important than baptizing, 1 Cor. 1 : 17." He quotes Luther, points to the confessions, and declares that "the Reformation placed preaching in the foreground."

Rohnert. The Rev. William Rohnert is a Silesian Lutheran pastor of exclusive orthodoxy. His book entitled: "The Doctrine of the Means of Grace according to the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions," is a classic. He writes thus: "*The most important and most comprehensive means of grace is the word of God*, which gives the sacraments their power. * *

The word of God is not only the unchangeable foundation of all knowledge of salvation, but it is also the bearer and mediator of all divine grace." He then calls the word "the source of redemption," "a creative divine power," "a power unto salvation." "In sum, the word of God is the means of grace *which brings to man all the grace of God, even that of the sacraments*. Of course this is said primarily of the *word of God as preached and heard*, for the scriptural designation of the word refers first of all to the word propagated orally" (pp. 11, 12). A more explicit testimony in favor of our Thesis could not easily be made. It reads like the words of the old Dogmaticians.

Frank. "Frank of Erlangen has proved a powerful apologist for old Lutheranism" (*Kurtz, Ch. Hist.*, III., p. 205). Frank is without doubt the ablest modern German Lutheran theologian. In his "System of Christian Truth" he treats the doctrine of the means of grace with a fulness and a profoundness to which no amount of quotation can do even approximate justice. He declares "the word to be the primary means of grace;" "that the

activity of the Holy Ghost in reference to the self-impartation of the Redeemer, takes place first of all through the word as means of grace." "The entire fulness of the potencies of redemption is placed in the word as means of grace." But Frank does not overlook or disparage the other means of grace. He seeks to set all in proper relation: "It is in harmony with the richness and gracious fulness of Christ, that in many ways, and not through the word alone, the gifts and powers of redemption proceed from him and are communicated through sensible means. Indeed, regarded according to the analogy of natural-human self-communication, it cannot be denied that among the means serving to this end the word undoubtedly takes the primary, the widely super-eminent position (bei Weitem überragende Stellung). Whilst other means are employed only occasionally, here or there, as serving the communication of thought and purpose, the word is everywhere employed in this service. Without the word the others could not in themselves reach their end. For the most part they presuppose the word and could not be understood without it. They do indeed in various ways supplement the communication by the word, but in a far higher degree they are supplemented by it. Farther on we will inquire how far this primary and universal character of the word of God asserts its place among the means of the self-communication of Christ" (p. 261). We now turn to pp. 301-5, where the great author seeks to establish the interrelation of word and sacrament as means. In the most distinct manner he asserts "die Praerogative des Wortes;" declares the dependence of the sacraments upon the word for their constitution; denies any such counter-dependence, but maintains that neither sacrament can work a blessing without the accession (*Hinsurritt*) of the word. "For Christ himself has connected the $\delta\imath\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ with the $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$. In missionary service preaching precedes adult baptism, and infant baptism can be properly administered only under the expectation that those thus baptized will afterwards submit to the operation of the word. In the Lord's Supper the worthiness, without which no one should approach, requires the preparation of the guests by the word; and the proper, blessed after-effect

of the supper requires also the use of the word. Thus from the first moment of its conscious entrance, the whole Christian life is placed under the word as the essential, *per se* independent, constantly abiding means of grace; while baptism according to the nature of the case, as sacrament of regeneration, asserts its place at the beginning; but the Lord's Supper indicates the hights of fellowship with the glorified Redeemer, which cannot exist continuously, but, occurring from time to time, presuppose as basis the fellowship by the word. Hence since the word is characterized as the more general, comprehensive means of grace, which embraces the others in the unity of one whole, the question still exists whether a like prerogative of the word is to be asserted in reference to the gifts of salvation which are distributed by the means of grace." All difference of gifts is of course denied: Christ cannot be divided. "Regeneration is ascribed to the word not less than to baptism. The flesh and blood of Christ are received by faith which is mediated by the word." "In every case the gift of salvation is mediated sensibly, and whether the sensible object be perceived by the hearing or by any other sense, makes no essential difference. In so far can we say of the word, that by virtue of its nature, it turns itself to the personality. Thus, however we may further explain individually these relative differences, which do not destroy the bond of unity and similarity, everywhere there comes up the primary and overowering importance of the word, which covers the whole subject of the communication of salvation, constitutes the sacraments as such, secures to them their blessed effect and mediates in its own way their specific character."

Such, in brief and imperfect representation, is the view of "a powerful apologist for old Lutheranism." In harmony with the true Protestant Scripture-principle the word is made the central, all-determining factor as means of grace. The sacraments are not degraded. By virtue of the superior position given to the word, they are lifted to a high and commanding plane. But the sphere of their operation is limited and dependent as compared with that of the word.

Rüling. Dean Rüling is pastor at Chemnitz. His little book

entitled "Fundamentals of the Christian Faith on the Basis of Frank's System of Christian Certainty," will furnish the last quotation under the present head: "The sacraments are not *co*-ordinate with the word. Much rather are they *sub*ordinate. From it they receive their constitution. What the sacraments *impart* to us can not be different from that which the word imparts, for there is only *one* salvation. If there be several ways of imparting this salvation, that is explained by the fulness of salvation and the manifold relations into which salvation enters. In still another relation are the sacraments subordinate to the word. The sacraments can perform special effects on the Christian. The sacrament of baptism can make the beginning of regeneration in the heart of a child. The sacrament of the Holy Supper can bring us sensibly near to the Lord. But these operations can come to the clear, distinct consciousness first through the word. And regeneration and conversion as already seen, never fully occur without the operation of the divine word," p. 69.

This little book of Rüling's was highly endorsed by Dr. Frank, and was commended by him to his students as a just synopsis of his system. It therefore carries with it the authority of the master. The language is different from that of the old Dogmaticians, but the teaching is the same. The sacraments have their special function, but they are dependent on the word for the full and salutary discharge of that function. This at once determines their place as compared with that of the word.

We now seek a final illustration for our Thesis.

THE WRITERS ON PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

At this point we are tempted to quote largely from the old liturgies; but the want of space forbids. We stand ready to fill pages with their testimony. We can only say now that almost the first thing that meets the eye on opening these old formularies, are the directions they give in regard to the teaching and preaching of the divine word, which, in full accord with Re-formers, Confessions and Dogmaticians, they exalt to the chief place. We must ask the reader to accept the testimony of em-

inent writers on practical theology. Funk who wrote two of the best of the older works on the Lutheran liturgies, says: "The purpose and essence of these formularies is the maintainance of the pure doctrine of God's word as it is based on the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures" (p. 12). He explains: "The evangelical Church not only brought preaching into use again, but brought it to the highest and most important place in the worship of the congregation, to the chief place and centre." He then gives a reason for this: "The foundation of the evangelical doctrine is living faith, and since this is wrought by the preaching of the gospel, that is the chief part in congregational worship" (KO., p. 73). This is the testimony of a professedly liturgical writer. It agrees exactly with that of Bachmann of Rostock, who, in his *Der Lit. Aufbau*, writes: "The word of God is the *primary*, the sacrament the *secondary*, derived means of grace." He says further that "the Lutheran Reformation gave to the preaching of the word of God its necessary place in the chief divine service," and "considered the preached *word* before everything as *means of grace*" (7, 8). This is the opinion of a thoroughly conservative liturgical scholar. The opinion is fully sustained by Hüffell whose work on Practical Theology was for half a century a standard in Germany. He says: "The Reformers were guided chiefly by two fundamental principles: 1) That the external worship in and of itself does not render us acceptable to God, and 2) that the preaching of the gospel is the chief thing" (II, 111). Equally decided is Kahnis ("occupied a strict Lutheran confessional standpoint," says Kurtz, III., 205): "Luther cannot often and emphatically enough declare that the word of God is the central point and ruling factor of the entire service" (*Der Innere Gang des Deutschen Protestantismus*, 125.)

We now introduce the three greatest writers on Practical Theology of recent times.

Von Zezschwitz. Dr. Von Zezschwitz of Erlangen, marked by an almost ultra Lutheran conservatism, wrote the "History of Preaching" for Zöckler's "*Handbuch*." He declares: "Luther's greatest merit is not only that he restored preaching to

its original purpose, as a true and fruitful explanation and application of the Holy Scripture, but much more that he set it in the centre of the whole evangelical worship. * * 'Faith comes by preaching and preaching from the word of God,' Rom. 10:17. Hence preaching and the word of God enter into the controlling central point in the evangelical worship. * * This central position of the word of God in the evangelical worship gave also to Luther's preaching formally its character." These statements he sustains by quotations from Luther's writings, and by expositions of Luther's views of preaching (Vol. IV., 297-8).

Harnack. Theodosius Harnack, professor at Dorpat ("stand-point that of sound Lutheranism," Meusel) wrote "Liturgics" for Zöckler's *Handbuch*. Under the sub-title, "*Ministration of the Word*," he says: "The word of God claims a central, all-dominating place in Christian worship. Luther says: 'A Christian should know that on earth there is no greater sanctity than God's word; for even the sacrament itself is made, blessed and hallowed by the word, and by it are we all born spiritually and consecrated to be Christians.' This great significance of the word finds first its place in *the liturgical lection*." He quotes Luther as saying that "where the word of God is not preached it were better neither to sing, nor to read, nor to assemble." "Preaching draws from the faith and life of the Church and from the preacher's individuality, but high above stands the Scripture as its quickening soul and directing norm" (Vol. IV., 421-2).

Achelis. Dr. Achelis of Marburg is without doubt the most distinguished living teacher of Practical Theology in Germany. Writing *historically* of Luther's view he declares: "The congregational service has its climax and culmination (Höhepunkt und Schlusspunkt) in preaching." "Preaching is the chief part which rules the whole public service." He then says: "This position of preaching the word in the congregational service in the evangelical Church is recognized specifically as a feature of the Reformation, although there have been loud voices which have sought to place the centre and climax of the Sunday congregational service elsewhere, especially in the celebration of the

Lord's Supper"*(*Prakt. Theol.* II., 5). The testimony of these writers on Practical Theology cannot be gainsaid. They show what Luther and the Lutheran Church have regarded as the chief means of grace, and as the ruling centre in Lutheran worship: THE WORD OF GOD AND THE PREACHING OF THE SAME. He who would change this position of the word in favor of any other means of grace, would be more Lutheran than Luther, or rather, much less so, for he would change that firm foundation on which Luther stood, and on which the Lutheran Church has always stood, as now shown by our investigations carried into every department of Lutheran theology. The Reformers, the Confessions, the Dogmaticians, the Liturgies, the writers on practical theology, all agree in making a decided difference between word and sacraments as means of grace and as factor in worship. In harmony with the full and clear testimony of the Scriptures they describe the word and the preaching of the same as the *chief*, the *primary*, the most *comprehensive* means of grace. They ascribe to it not only constitutive power for the sacraments, but power to effect every work of grace. They give it the *central* place in public worship, as that which must control every part of the public worship, and determine the architecture of the church. All that precedes the sermon must point to the sermon as the centre and climax of the congregation's worship, as the part in which every member of the congregation may find something for himself. All that follows the sermon must tend to deepen and prolong the impression made by the sermon. The pulpit must be placed above the altar and must be made to

*Dr. Buchrucker, Oberconsistorialrath in Munich, a confessional Lutheran of very high rank, says in his *Grundlinien der Christ. Katechetik*, p. 22: "Even up to the most recent times efforts have been made in the Lutheran Church to procure for the Lord's Supper again the dominating place, and to form 'Lord's Supper congregations,' but these were soon recognized as the result of Catholicizing inclinations." He then very justly says that the sound condition of church life depends upon holding word and sacrament in their right relation. But what this relation is he clearly enough indicates when he says: "Since it (the Church) is essentially a congregation of faith, the word remains the chief means for its self-actualization."

command the entire auditorium. Any deviation from these principles, either in church architecture or in any other way, veers towards Romanism. Any seeking of the centre and climax of congregational worship in the sacrament as *means of grace*, departs from the historical teaching of the Church. The *secondary*, derived means of grace can never rise above, can never be equal to the *primary*, the independent means. The secondary, derived means, can not be held by Lutherans as co-ordinate with the primary, since according to standard Lutheran teaching, it is not only more limited in range, and operates *mediately*, but is absolutely dependent upon the word for its character and for its final efficiency in every particular. In opposition to Zwinglian teaching the Lutheran System has always maintained that the sacraments are means of grace, bearers of grace, channels through which grace comes to man. But in opposition to Roman Catholic teaching, beginning with the Reformation and continuing on down through her entire history, she has laid the chief stress on the word of preaching as the most essential and the most important means of grace, and has found the all-dominating centre and climax of congregational worship in the same word of preaching, in which the entire congregation can take part by meditation and reflection.

Half a century ago the so-called "New Lutherans" sought to find the centre and climax of worship in the Lord's Supper, but they did not even pretend to be following the lead of the Reformation. With various Romanizing and Puseyiting tendencies, they boldly declared that the Reformation gave too much prominence to preaching. Löhe would place the altar in the centre, where it should rule the entire service, and would have every divine service terminate with the Holy Supper as "the perfected summit of all the life of public worship."* Accordingly his

*Very justly has von Zezschwitz said in reference to these unevangelical extremes: "In the presence of the evangelical principle, and of the history of the cultus-life in different times, the declaration of many modern representations of the liturgical movements, will not be justified, viz., that the preaching service with suitable liturgy, but without the congregation's

Liturgy was closely modeled after the Romish Missal, and his theory of the ministry was approximately sacerdotal. Some of the school went so far as to avow the *opus operatum*, and to set forth the sacraments as material acts of God, and to wish for a restoration of the Romish Mass. Others held that the word has an evaporating, changing character. Only the sacraments are permanent. New names were given to the different parts of divine worship. Reversing the relation of cause and effect, and the logical order, the word, the generic, was subsumed under the sacrament, the specific, so that both word and sacrament should be called "the sacramental part." Contrary to three hundred years of interpretation they sought to associate this design-

celebration of the Holy Supper, does not deserve the name of chief divine service (Hauptgottesdienst). Much rather is this, from the liturgical principle, to be considered as a deformation" (Herzog, V., 317). And in arguing for the complete separation of the preaching service from the communion service as in harmony with primitive usage and with Luther's intention, von Zeschwitz vindicates to the preaching service as against "our modern cultus-idealists," "Puseyites," "Greek and Roman churches," the right to be considered Hauptgottesdienst (chief service) by the following unanswerable argument: "The right of the independent preaching-service to be considered as Hauptgottesdienst is established both by the Pentecost event which inaugurated the prevailing traditional hour for it, and in principle by the significance of the New Testament *word* as the most universal means of grace. To the word before everything else must it be conceded of itself independently to form the central point of cultus-Christian worship with the claim that this deserves to be called 'Hauptgottesdienst' of the Christian congregation." Herzog, IX., 789.

In the same interest and with equal emphasis does Bachmann declare, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church knows of Hauptgottesdienste without the Supper, but of none without the preaching of the word. The principle is this: That which is chief as means of grace must be chief in worship, for as von Zeschwitz quotes from Luther "a fundamental thought of the Reformation : " "Denn es am Worte und nicht an der Messe leigt," and then asks: "When will our modern cultus-idealists learn from these fundamental principles of the Reformation, which are both intelligible and scripturally correct?" Even the liturgical service has no independent place in the worship. It is a part of a unified whole which is controlled by the sermon. Its chief office is to lead up to the sermon and to prepare the mind and heart for the reception of the truth through preaching, and to deepen and prolong the impression made by the preaching.

nation with a passage in the Apology so as to give it symbolical authority.*

But this school of innovators has quite passed away in Germany. The old Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace, has reasserted itself. The new terminology has been almost entirely abandoned by living writers on worship, as illogical, *inapropos*, and as not contained in the legitimate interpretation of the Apology, since it cannot be shown that Melanchthon meant to propound a theory of worship, but on the contrary was defining a sacrament in opposition to the Romish theory, which makes the Holy Supper chiefly a sacrifice. Books recently received from Germany enable the writer to make the statements contained in this paragraph, and with his own ears he heard (1893) the whole terminology of "the sacramental" and "the sacrificial" denounced as "a false conception," by one of the foremost liturgical scholars in the Lutheran Fatherland. Alas that the ghost of this defunct school should have emigrated to America! But the temporary clamor of a few "loud voices" cannot long disturb the historical consensus of Lutheran teaching on the means of grace, and on the principles of worship, viz., that the *primary*, the most essential, the all-comprehending means of grace, and

*The passage is as follows: "A sacrament is a ceremony or an external sign or work, through which God grants that which the divine promise, annexed to the ceremony, offers," p. 313. According to the perverse theory the divine word is a "ceremony" or "external sign." The absurdity of the interpretation is shown by the fact that Melanchthon illustrates by referring to Baptism, and a little further on specifically classes "the preaching of the Gospel" among the "sacrifices of praise," along with "faith, prayer, thanksgiving, confession," thus agreeing perfectly with Luther's view of preaching as being "the more proper worship of the New Testament." It is not out of place to say that a letter now in the writer's possession from a late member of the theological faculty at St. Louis, states that the Missourians reject this new-fangled interpretation, and Prof. Schuette of Columbus states that the word "sacramental" used "to include the Word" is an "extension of the term as used especially among liturgiologists" (*Before the Altar*, p. 83), that is, *some* liturgiologists have read into the Apology what, confessedly, Melanchthon never put there, and have committed the logical blunder of making the specific, that is, the sacrament, give name to the generic, that is, the word. Is this subscribing the confessions "in their own true, native, original and only meaning"?

the all-regulating centre of congregational worship, is the preaching and teaching of the word of God. There is, according to Lutheran teaching, absolutely no work of divine grace, which the preached word cannot do. Illumination, faith, regeneration, sanctification, all find instrumental cause in the word of God and in the preaching of the same. "On earth there is no greater sanctity than the word of God." It makes and hallows, precedes and follows the sacraments, which as "ceremonies," "rites," "signs," are adapted to make profound impressions of religious truth, as they set forth great facts of redemption. Their gift depends upon the appointment of God. They offer grace; but they convey grace only where there is faith, where the human subjectivity meets the divine objectivity. The divine objectivity is always the same. When faith rises to a climax and appropriates the perfect redemption which the sacraments signify, then a perfect union is established between the human and the divine. Baptism sets me objectively in the Kingdom of God. When I believe this fact, I know that I am a son of God. The Holy Supper sets before me objectively the body and blood of Christ. When I believe this fact, Christ is mine. Thus the sacraments are means of grace. But it is by the word that I have learned that God is my Father; and by the word that I am informed that the blood of Jesus Christ was shed for the remission of sins. But these two facts, the fatherhood of God and the atonement of Christ, are the essence of the Gospel. Ceremonies, rites, signs, can add nothing to the gospel. They can only ratify and seal its message. The *verbum vocale* is supplemented by the *verbum visible*. The eye has assisted the ear in conveying the message of the gospel to the mind and heart. Should the sign fail I still have the promise. When as a preacher I proclaim that promise to others, I offer unto God the highest sacrifice of praise. When as a sinner I believe that promise, I offer unto God the highest sacrifice of self-surrender. In the word then as preached and believed is found the climax of worship.*

*"When I preach then, I give praise to the Lord our God, and have the morning and evening sacrifice. For he delights that one should preach of him, and preaching is the highest offering of any one," says Luther.

That in the communion of the Lord's Supper, the administration of which, according to the Lutheran conception, is based on individual need—"the sacrament is administered to those who desire it," *Apology*—the personal intercourse of the believer with his Saviour reaches a climax, is due not to the sacrament as *means of grace* in the sense that in contradistinction from the word as *means of grace*, it has some new or higher grace to impart; but to the fact that in the Supper, the word, supplemented by the ceremony, quickens the faith, love and devotion of the Christian, which reach a climax in believing and realizing that Christ is present, and that he fulfills the promise of the Gospel. The objective gift and the right subjective apprehension meet in perfect communion. Christ is mine and I am his. My heart gives way to thanksgiving and praise, which on the subjective side may be climax of worship for all who join in with sincerity and truth. But this climax, call it climax of communion, or climax of worship, is absolutely dependent upon the word preached and heard, which has produced the appropriating faith, and stimulated the religious affections. And high above this climax stands that higher climax of the preached word, which, as God's chief instrument of redemption, comes to the *entire* congregation, and gives to each as he hath need the blessing of the divine wisdom, and certifies all of the reproofing, forgiving, sanctifying divine grace.*

*With clear insight into the principles of the Gospel does Dr. Spitta say: "The climax (der Höhepunkt) of evangelical worship is there where the entire congregation can really take part, and in proportion as it (the entire congregation) falls into the back-ground, the nature of evangelical faith suffers detriment," *Der Entwurf der Preuss. Agende*, p. 15. This observation is based on the principle of the universal priesthood of believers, and on the doctrine that the Church is chiefly a society of faith and of the Holy Ghost in the heart. The congregation does not need priestly mediation. It can go as a whole directly to God, and may find climax of worship in confession, prayer, song, in *hearing* the divine word. Such should be named the *subjective* climax of worship, or the point at which the *devotions* of the congregation reach their culmination. But such is not the highest point or the controlling principle in the congregation's worship taken as a whole. All religion, and preëminently the religion of the gospel is chiefly receptivity, or the receiving of a gift and of

Hence "the *secondary*, derived means of grace" can never push the primary, the unconditioned, the all-embracing means out of its central, all-dominating place in Lutheran worship, without shifting the centre of the System from the fourth to the tenth article, and without changing the evangelical ministry whose throne is the pulpit, into a Catholic priesthood whose throne is the altar.

grace from God, and not spontaneity, or the expression of the devotional feelings. The truly Christian congregation does not assemble in the sanctuary for the purpose of unloading its *devotions*, but for the purpose of receiving the divine blessing which the Holy Ghost communicates through the truth, and which calls forth the devotions of the congregation. Thus the objective factor in congregational worship is the creator of the subjective factor, and is also the creative factor for the sacrament. Whatever the latter has, it has through the *word*. Whatever climax of devotion it creates, it creates through the *word*. Hence rising above the *devotions*, and above the sacrament, is the *word*, which as *causa efficiens* for personal faith, and for the quickening of the spirit of devotion, either with or without the sacrament, must ever remain, in the form of preaching, the true *objective* climax of the congregation's worship. "In this way,"—that is, by combining the two in proper relation of superior and subordinate,—"the congregational worship is unified, and the prophetic part, which reaches its climax in the preaching of the divine word, is realized as the ruling power." Achelis, *Prakt. Theol.*, II., p. 243. Or as Köstlin, in full harmony with the fundamental principles of this entire discussion puts it: "In order that the *congressus publici* may maintain and render the divine worship they must be essentially assemblies for hearing the *word* of God, for common prayers and for giving of thanks. Or, the constituting factor of the divine worship is objectively the *word* of God (and the sacraments) and subjectively faith, which expresses itself in prayer and thanks. Only where these two meet can the *congressus publici* be considered as divine services, as acts of worship in the full sense." *Geschichte des Christ. Gottesd.*, p. 159. By placing "sacraments" in parenthesis it is very evident that Köstlin does not mean to coördinate them as factor in worship with "the *word* of God."

ARTICLE III.

THE RELATION OF WORD AND SACRAMENT.

Translated from Thomasius' *Christi Person und Werk.* 170, II. Auflage.
By REV. J. S. BRAKEN.

We did not premise our treatise on Baptism and the Holy Supper with a special paragraph on the Sacrament, because its doctrine is nothing more than the presentation of what is common to both actions, with the elimination of what is peculiar to each. Now, in closing, there is needed but a short retrospect in order to define the nature of the Sacrament *per se*, as well as its relation to the Word; for only from the relation of the Sacraments to the Word is it possible to understand their meaning and essence. It is a relation of *oneness* and of *distinction*.

The oneness is obvious and generally acknowledged. Both Word and Sacrament form the category of the means of grace; both serve the application of one and the same salvation to man; this is their common aim. Both are self-attestations of Christ through human instrumentality and creature mediation; both comprehend the salvation which they mediate to man, namely, the one Christ: the Word, the divine Spirit; the Sacrament, the theanthropic Christ. This is their common characteristic. Both are means of grace having as their content vitalizing energy. This equality must by no means be mistaken or violated.

But within this sameness we have to recognize also a difference, and this difference is to be found first of all in the mode of operation. This difference, now, must be defined—that we may as well anticipate—not so that the one means of grace is a substitute for the other, that the use of the Word makes the Sacrament superfluous, and *vice versa*. Rather should we expect it of the divine wisdom, which in its use of means in other spheres is so sparing, that the peculiar operation of the one means of grace always finds its complement in the other, and requires its co-operation. The object, therefore, the complete appropriation of

redemption, can only be attained through the concurrence of both. But each makes the other actually complete only if either contains something which the other lacks, if either has a specifically different mode of operation, complementing the other. To define this difference properly, is the problem.

It is certainly an error (this is the outcome of what is said above) to seek to define it by degrading either the objectivity of the Sacraments, or the quickening power of the Word, by regarding the former as merely signs and seals of grace, the latter as a mere witness of Jesus devoid of formative, creative energy (literally: to inform man with its contents). Both effect and confer what they say and signify. Yet, again, the difference cannot be limited to this, that the Word is speech, the Sacrament action. The latter, to be sure, is preëminently God's act, God's act of applying and specifically individualizing by means of visible elements. But the Word, too, if preached, has the character of an act, an applicative act, especially in the form of absolution, whilst again the confirmation which the Sacraments afford to faith is conditioned by the Word into which they are set [like the diamond in a golden ring, Tr.]. It is frequently said, indeed, that the sacramental signs offer assistance to human weakness, and thus render faith easier; but it is a question whether it is not easier to rest our faith upon the clear Word than upon the mystical tokens which the Word has to interpret. The latter is perhaps the more difficult. The difference has, therefore, to be defined in some other way. In accordance with our presentation (§62-69), it may be developed in the following propositions:

1. The Word effects a new attitude of the human personality, the Sacrament a new relation. The Word effects a new attitude of the human personality *gradually* by opening to it, mediating, and informing it with, its content, salvation. The Sacrament effects a new relation of man to God by giving him *at once* the participation in redemption. In *one* moment, by means of *one* act, Baptism implants the individual into Christ and his Church; in a *single* moment Christ gives us in the Holy Supper his glorified corporeity that we may partake of it. There the effect is diffused, here it is focused in a single sacramental

act. The effect of the Word is, therefore, thus far, more explicative and discursive, that of the Sacraments is more drastic, concentrated.

2. But a further difference is found in this, that the Word with its testimony is directed to the selfconscious personality of man, and influences not only it, but also in and through it the whole man. The Sacrament is directed to the nature of man, by which we understand by no means solely the corporeity, but the whole spiritu-corporeal constitution of man, which the reflecting *ego* discriminates from itself as much as it knows itself to be united with it. To this side of human nature, which is never fully disclosed to the consciousness and yet is found so intimately in rapport with it, to this province of our being, the effect of the Sacraments relates directly, whilst that of the Word always and primarily concerns the intelligence and will, and only by means of these lays hold on the human substance, (*Wessensgrund*). This should not surprise us. For even in the general sphere of human life it is not the thinking *ego*, not the reflecting consciousness, but the heart, whence spring the great creative thoughts. Here, in the innermost depths is found also the treasure chamber of the intellectual life; how long does the mind often labor there, moving mysteriously until suddenly a great idea or a mighty principle breaks into clear consciousness, and when it has risen one stands before it amazed; it is not so much a product begotten of one's thinking, as a birth experienced by him. So exceedingly important is this sphere of the human nature. Should it not also be important for the sphere of salvation, should not saving grace be preëminently directed to it? That this is so requires no further proofs after the preceding paragraphs; for it almost irresistibly forces itself upon every unprejudiced consideration not only of the Lord's Supper but also of Holy Baptism.

3. And what has thus been reached points, thirdly, to a still deeper background, namely, that the Word is the medium, through which the Spirit of Christ communicates himself to our self-conscious personality in order to create in it saving faith.

The Sacrament, on the other hand, is the medium which grafts us into the communion of the holy human nature of Christ (Baptism), and makes us partakers of it (Eucharist), as appears from our representation of the Sacraments respectively.

4. Hereto we add, fourthly, what is most closely connected with it, that Baptism places us into the organism of the Church of Christ, the glorified Godman, the Holy Communion deepens us therein, as also according to universal ecclesiastical practice Baptism makes one only a member of the Church in general, the partaking of the Eucharist a member of the Confession. Thus the Sacraments are church-formative factors, whilst, in turn this their significance depends precisely upon this, that they are actions of the congregation (church) of the Lord—a circumstance which is not always sufficiently emphasized.

The difference between the two means of grace, we may therefore fix in these four points. But this difference stands in close connection with the nature and object of the whole of redemption, and receives again from this fact its full light. Man is by virtue of his creation the living unity of nature and personality, (substance and consciousness). This unity makes him a person. Now, as sin has separated the whole man both in his personality and nature from God, and has disturbed both spheres of life, so redemption proposes to heal man according to both relations, and to make him partaker of salvation. It will appropriate to the whole man the whole Christ. And to this, now, relates the different position and effect of the Word and the Sacraments. Each aims at the whole man; but each lays hold immediately on a different side of man; the Word on the self-conscious personality, the Sacrament on his nature or substance, in order to work from hence meditately upon the other side (for the Word also operates through the personal willing and thinking upon the heart, and Baptism, out from the heart, in which it puts the spirit of regeneration, upon the *ego*) The word mediates to him the fellowship of the Spirit of Christ, the Sacrament the fellowship of the glorified human nature of Christ, that thus the whole salvation may be appropriated to the whole man, that the whole person be saved and sanctified. And not in such a way as if both op-

erations were utterly disconnected : in the Sacrament they meet together in so far as it is set into the Word, especially in the Eucharist, which is only intended for persons who have a developed self-consciousness. From this the importance of both means of grace for the individual becomes clearer, their essential mutual connection as well as their difference. It is seen that neither makes the other superfluous, that each has its necessary complement in the other. Without the Word the Sacrament would be a silent enigma ; without the faith-producing power of the Word the relation in which Baptism puts man to God would be merely an objective one ; the gift of the Holy Spirit which it imbeds in the heart would otherwise be a treasure hidden in a field. Without the appropriating personal faith, in spite of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, there would be no personal saving fellowship with Christ, no personal justification ; and the sacramental communication without being able to develop its blessing, is gradually withdrawn or it will finally bring the recipient into condemnation. The Word holds therefore the first place in the economy of redemption, faith is decisive for salvation. He who without fault of his own is deprived of the Sacraments may possibly be saved by grace through faith alone. To such an one, on the other hand, there is also something wanting of a full all-sided participation of salvation. His subjective faith lacks the seal of the objective acts of God. There is wanting to the believer the consoling certitude that also that side of his being which even the sanctified will never fully master, is admitted into the actual fellowship with Christ. There is wanting to the pneumatic-ethical life the basis (*Realgrund*) of the theanthropic nature of Christ, in which it can be planted, on which it can subsist. There is wanting to the individual the organic incorporation into the Christian community ; the whole Christian life in general is too one-sided, spiritualistic and therefore also much more exposed to the changes and influences of the natural life ; the glorified Godman is not yet fully appropriated in the new man ; *only through the combined agency of both means of grace*, the Word and the Sacraments, can the one object of salvation be entirely attained. This is our opinion, which, as we hope, corresponds with the Scripture.

ARTICLE IV.

PROVIDENCE IN OUR HISTORY.

By REV. T. F. DORNBASER, A. M.

The hand that moves the world is the hand that makes history. "History is but the exponent of God's Providence." It is prophecy fulfilled.

In the annals of human progress we discover two essential factors, the Divine and the human,—the sword of the Lord and of Gideon. Our national history, marvelous as it is, is no exception to this dual agency, which is very fitly recognized, it seems to me, in the appointment of two services in connection with Memorial Day.

The former is observed on the Sabbath preceding the thirtieth of May, usually as a union service among the churches in a community, at which one of the pastors preaches a Memorial sermon to the surviving veterans of the war, emphasizing more especially the divine agency, as one important factor in achieving our national greatness and glory, leaving it to our able and eloquent orators on the succeeding *holiday*, to memorialize the valor and heroism of the men who offered their lives to achieve so great a victory.

Let us then turn, for a moment, to that invisible, though mighty agent, whose eye witnessed, and whose hand controlled the issues of the battle.

"Providence is the soul of the world." All nature feels the touch of omnipotence. God ruleth by his power forever. "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good. He sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." He maketh the winds his messengers, and the lightnings his ministering spirits.

Nothing is too great, nothing is too small to engage his providential care. He guides Arcturus and his sons, he binds the sweet influences of Pleaides, he condescends to clothe the lilly

and the grass of the fields, which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven. "He openeth his hand, and giveth to every living thing his meat in due season." "Behold the fowls of the air, they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them." Neither doth a sparrow, though two be sold for a farthing, fall to the ground without his notice. "Are ye not much better than they?"

You may not all agree as to the extent and influence of God's providence in the life of the individual man. But I am persuaded that every soldier who witnessed the awful carnage of battle, who faced the tempest of leaden hail which swept away his comrades on right and left, who stood almost alone among the dead and the dying, I am persuaded, I say, that such soldier will not attribute his good fortune to any magic wand he wielded or to any impervious armor he wore, but he is inclined to leave the mystery of his escape in the hand and heart of a merciful and inscrutable providence.

How well the commander-in-chief of our armies, Gen'l U. S. Grant, has anticipated our thoughts to-day, in the introductory words to his memoirs; which will be read by coming generations with a profounder interest than the commentaries of Cæsar. "Man proposes and God disposes. There are but few important events in the affairs of men, brought about by their own choice." So says the greatest general of modern times. And a wiser man than he has said, "A man's heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps."

"The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." "His eyes behold the nations, let not the rebellious exalt themselves." "He removeth kings, and setteth up kings." "The king's heart is in the hands of the Lord as the rivers of water; he turneth it whithersoever he will."

"All history," says Emerson, "becomes subjective; in other words there is properly no history, only biography." The complete history of a nation, therefore, is but the aggregate memoirs of the individuals comprising it.

The great battles mark the mile-stones in the world's civilization. They designate the birth-days of new eras in civil gov-

ernment. They are but the culmination, the crises, of a long series of preparatory influences. In one sense, they are as terrible and destructive as the eruptions of Vesuvius, in the other, they are as fruitful of good as the blossoms of Spring-time. The tree has its epochs of flowering and fruit-bearing, and so has the nation.

"The battle is the Lord's." When the son of Jesse went forth to meet the vaunting, uncircumcised Philistine, his arm was nerved to a surer aim by the assurance that the God of Israel was with him, and, in answer to the disdainful threat of the mail-clad giant, he said, "And this assembly shall know, that God saveth not with sword and spear; for the battle is the Lord's." The victory justified his venture upon God's providence.

"The battle is the Lord's." With this axe he blazes the path of human progress. With this rod he has divided the opposing waters of the old world and the new alike. With this sword he determined the trend of sacred and profane history. There was an arm higher than that of Joshua, which determined the victory against the Amalakites in the plain of Rephidim. It must have humiliated that brave leader and his gallant soldiers to learn, after the victory was won, that the issues of the battle were decided, not by their superior valor, but by the rise and fall of the rod of God in the hand of Moses.

The battle-shout of the three hundred, armed with pitchers and torches and trumpets, descending upon the host of the Midianites, fitly symbolizes the divine and human agency in earthly warfare for, as they rushed upon the enemy, they cried "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon."

There are examples in secular and profane history, where, it would seem, that the divine agency was no less apparent and influential in deciding the issues of the conflict. Let us for a moment take our stand on the heights of Marathon, 490 years B. C., and witness the landing of that magnificent army of 150,000 mail-clad Persian warriors flushed by a hundred victories. They came not only to subdue and degrade the classic soil of Greece, but they came to determine the destiny of Europe. Shall this horde of barbarians pass unobstructed through this

gate-way to the West, and forever bind the civilization of Europe in the chains of a luxurious and sensuous orientalism?

Opposed to them is a band of 10,000 men, overawed by the numbers and prowess of their enemies, but nerved with a sense of devout faith in the favorable omens of their gods. The leaders deliberate and determine to give battle. They assail the foe with an impetuosity and determined bravery that is characteristic of earnest, heaven-sent men. Miltiades, with his brave colleagues, was inspired with the thought only of saving Greece, not thinking that the destiny of Europe hung on the issues of that day.

The Athenians, over-joyed at the signal victory, promptly offered sacrifices of thanksgiving to their tutelary deities, and, whom they ignorantly worshiped in this instance, the apostle of the Gentiles afterwards declared unto them was none other than Jehovah, the Prince of Peace. The subsequent battles of Thermopyla, Salamis, and Platae, speak like so many prophetic voices, declaring the important part this small peninsula should play in educating and refining the nations of the earth.

The language of the Greeks, the richest and most euphonious, was destined to become the honored medium through which to publish to the world the Gospel of peace and good-will unto men.

It must become evident to the devout student, that all human history centres in the Cross of Calvary.

He that would find the key to the mystery of divine providence, must keep his eye on the great scheme of redemption. "The work of redemption," as one has well said, "is the *sum* of all providences."

Christianity is a miracle in history. It is the off-spring of a Divine Father and a human mother.

It took 4,000 years to prepare the world for its introduction.

For this purpose God raised up three important nations, with their centres of influence respectively in Jerusalem, Athens, and Rome.

The Jewish nation, in the midst of a heathen world, became the custodian of the oracles of God.

The cultured Greeks furnished the pictures of silver, in which

the writers of the new dispensation could set their apples of gold.

Rome, with her imperial Caesars, must break down the barriers between the nations, by establishing a universal empire, and thus build a high-way, upon which swift evangelists could carry the good news of man's redemption to the ends of the earth.

Alexander and Napoleon were the instruments in the hands of God to scourge the wicked and idolatrous nations, that set themselves against the light of nature and of revelation.

They cast the crowns of many haughty monarchs to the ground; they swept through the despotisms of the old world like a whirl-wind, but in order to prevent them from setting up a worse despotism instead, their careers were suddenly and unexpectedly terminated.

Alexander, at the age of 33, in the very zenith of his glory, dies very unexpectedly from the effects of excessive drinking, while indulging the dream of future conquests.

The star of Napoleon, which won such lustre on the fields of Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, and Wagram, fell at the feet of the iron-Duke at Waterloo, never again to rise. The iron-crown of Charlemagne, which Napoleon had donned with such an air of imperialism, was suddenly ground into powder.

Kings and nations have a claim upon the favor and protection of providence, only so long as they are disposed to carry out the beneficent designs of their Creator.

When they fail to recognize, any longer, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, the two fundamental principles of human government, their days are numbered, their downfall is at hand.

The three great nations which are shaping the history of the world to-day are Germany, England, and America, with their respective seats of government at Berlin, London, and Washington.

Germany, with her great universities is the teacher of science and philosophy.

England with her splendid army and navy is opening the way for Christian civilization in India, in the Dark Continent, and in the Isles of the sea.

America, with her free institutions and her increasing millions of liberty-loving citizens, is designed to lift her *torch* higher than all others in her beneficent mission of "*enlightening the world.*"

The theatre of providence is transferred from the old to the new world. Here, again, "the battle is the Lord's."

We believe "the battle is the Lord's" because the results far transcend the intention and purpose of the human actors.

The early settlers, who landed on Plymouth Rock, with their Bibles and their babies, could never have dreamed that their Bible-taught offspring would witness such national greatness and mechanical triumphs, as were exhibited at the World's Fair in Chicago. Providence seemed only to favor the permanent settlement of such colonies as came with the open Bible. The enemies of that Book—the magna-charts of our liberties—failed to maintain a permanent foot-hold on the virgin soil of America.

Many of those early pioneers were the disciples of Calvin, of Luther, of Zwingli, of Knox, and later on, of Wesley and Whitefield. "Our fathers," said the eloquent Webster, "were brought hither by their high veneration for the Christian religion. They journeyed by its light, and labored in its hope."

The battle for independence was opened by Patrick Henry in the House of Burgesses of Virginia.

With impassioned utterance he denounced the usurpations of a foreign potentate. "Cæsar had his Brutus, Charles his Cromwell, and George the III.—(treason cried the speaker), and George III., may profit by their examples." Turning to the speaker he said, "Sir, if this be treason, make the *most of it.*"

This champion of liberty, in company with Col. Washington, rode horse-back from Virginia to Philadelphia to attend the first Colonial Congress. Here the orator played a most important part. He opened the battle with arguments and invectives. In order to allay sectional jealousies, he made the memorable declaration, "I am not a Virginian, but an American."

Samuel Adams moved that Congress be opened with prayer. Some objected because of the difference in their denominational affiliations. To meet this objection, the mover said that he was

a Congregationalist, and had no objections to inviting a minister of any other denomination. He therefore moved that the Rev. Duché, an Episcopal minister of Philadelphia, be appointed as permanent chaplain.

That morning it was reported that the British batteries were bombarding the city of Boston. This made the occasion all the more solemn.

The chaplain read the Episcopal service until he came to the prayer, and then he closed the book, and offered an extemporeaneous prayer which moved many to tears. All stood during the prayer except Washington, who knelt devoutly at his desk.

This man, who so humbled himself, was soon to be exalted to be Commander-in-chief of the Colonial army.

This preliminary skirmishing in the halls of legislation culminated in the Battle of Bunker Hill, 119 years ago this June, 1894.

Although the Americans, out-numbered two to one, were finally compelled to abandon the field, yet the results of the battle were so manifestly in their favor, as to bring to them the prophecy of future triumph. The enemy's dead out-numbered their own almost three to one. The heroism and crude generalship of Prescott, Putnam and Stark, afforded inspiration for future endeavor. The patriotic service and noble sacrifice of Warren led his associates to a more thorough consecration of themselves to the cause of freedom.

Warren was a Major-General, but he came to serve in the ranks as a private soldier. Putnam and Prescott offered him the command of the army. He positively declined. He shouldered the musket, and fought in the ranks as a volunteer until he was shot through the head by a musket ball. Such unselfish patriotism kindled a fire in the hearts of his countrymen which lasted even to the last battle of the Revolution.

Those noble patriots, who fought so gallantly on that memorable field, had as yet avowed no intention to separate from the mother country. But providence is always bolder than men. In the mind of God, it was intended that this battle was to

sound the bugle-note that, two years later, should proclaim the Declaration of American Independence.

After the Revolution was over, the new government started out under a free and liberal Constitution, to enjoy a long season of peace and prosperity.

Again the notes of conflict were heard in the halls of Congress.

The war for the Union was foreshadowed in the animated and masterly debates between Webster, Hayne and Calhoun, in 1830 to 1835.

The later and more violent attack of Preston S. Brooks of South Carolina is regarded by our best historians as the precursor of our great civil war.

On May 22nd, 1856, Brooks approached Mr. Sumner while seated at his desk in the Senate chamber engaged in writing, and struck him without warning, repeatedly over the head with a heavy gutta-percha cane. Mr. Sumner blinded by the blows, strove to rise and free himself from the restraint of the desk, but finally became unconscious from the repeated blows; from the effects of which, his biographer says, he never fully recovered. Those who applauded that act on the one hand and those who disapproved of it met, five years later, on many a bloody field, to measure strength with the sword.

This battle for liberty and union, we believe, was the Lord's from beginning to end, from Harper's Ferry to Appomattox. During its continuance there was a Moses in the mount and a Joshua in the field.

Again, the results of the conflict so far exceeded the most sanguine expectations of the human combatants, that the palm most rightfully belongs to the hand that is unseen. How many or rather how few, in the ranks of either army, expected these belligerent states to be again united in a more perfect and indissoluble bond of union than ever before; and surely none but a few prophets among us could foresee the emancipation of four millions of slaves.

We enlisted to save the Union and not to free the negro. Many of us could not understand the will of Providence, until

we saw his hand-writing in the blood of the slain. When we marched through the streets of Nashville, after the fall of Fort Donaldson, we heard the shout from the dusky cloud of colored people on either side. Some of the oldest slaves wept and shouted, "Glory Hallelujah," "Moses am a'coming," "De Lord am answering our prayers!" We pitied their ignorance, and laughed at their credulity. The President of the United States had avowed his purpose, not to interfere with this time-honored institution, but his conscience was quickened by the disaster at Bull Run, and when he heard the roar of two hundred cannon at Antietam he solemnly promised to proclaim his intention to free the slaves, if the Union arms should be victorious.

On the first day of December, 1863, the battle of Stone River was in progress, and up to that time the enemy had been signally victorious. On this day the President was to make the Emancipation Proclamation final and absolute, by adding to it the seal of his own signature. From that day to the end, the battle swayed to and fro, but manifestly with increasing favor to the Union cause. On the first and second days at Gettysburg it was low tide, but on the third it rose again, and on the fourth of July, 1863, the victorious wave from Vicksburg on the Mississippi brought the Union cause to flood-tide. The most conspicuous actors in this bloody drama, are firmly persuaded that God had a hand in this conflict. In the present administration at Washington, we have an exhibition of a restored and reconstructed Union, such as the wildest enthusiast could not have dreamed of in the sixties. In the present cabinet the Blue and the Grey sit in the same councils, and are sworn to maintain the honor of the same flag. The Secretary of State, with distinguished honor, wore the blue, the Secretary of the Navy wore the grey, with equal gallantry.

Since April 1st, 1861, the men of both sections have learned lessons, which have inculcated a respect for one another, and an affection for the old flag, which never existed before. Brave men esteem those foes very highly who prove themselves worthy of their steel.

The war for the Union is over, and the soldier who wore the blue certainly has no reason to be dissatisfied with the result.

It behooves us, then, to apply ourselves to the conflict which is yet to be waged in the interest of our country.

The battle is still on, and the "battle is still the Lord's." We hear picket-firing along certain lines which in the future may be marked by the blood of the slain.

The battle against the saloon, against the encroachments of Rome, and against the open desecration of the Lord's Day, can and should be fought with ballots and not bullets.

These enemies of the peace, purity, and safety of our country can be met and overthrown if every man, woman and child who loves the open Bible and the old flag will "come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

In this war there is no discharge. We are greatly encouraged by the fact, that in this moral conflict our late foes of the sunny South have become our most splendid allies. Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina and other States south of the Ohio, are coming well to the front in this battle for reform.

The North, flushed with victory and pampered with riches, is disposed to forget the Rock from whence she is hewn, and to violate the Commandments of God. Woe unto this fair land, if it should fall under the judgments of the Almighty! "Out of his mouth goeth a sword, and with it he shall smite the nations."

Let every true patriot array himself on the Lord's side of this irrepressible conflict and trust to him for victory.

"Our Father's God, to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light,
Protect us by thy might
Great God our King."

ARTICLE V.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE VS. EVIL

By REV. JOHN T. GLADHILL, A. M.

The problem of evil in the world is hard to understand. Wise men in all ages have wrestled with it. Many explanations have involved God in such a way as to make him the author of evil, or a silent conspirator against man, in his endeavor to overcome it. That God sanctions physical evils, or permits them, is almost a universally accepted doctrine; and that they are necessary to teach Christians to submit to all the acts of divine providence. It is almost an act of temerity to call in question the deep wrought thought.

Divine providence is in no way responsible for the advent of evil, nor for its continuation in the world. This proposition we shall endeavor to defend.

I. God appointed man to be the moral and responsible governor of the world. He was not appointed an ambassador to do God's will, but to have dominion over all creatures, animal, vegetable and mineral, (Gen. 1 : 28 and 9 : 1, 2). Jesus endowed the disciples with the authority of heaven and earth, so that they possessed all spiritual and moral power to make disciples of the nations, and teach them to observe the divine commandments, (Matt. 28 : 18-20) and that commission contained the salvation or condemnation of the whole creation, (Mark 16:15,16) "The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God," (Rom. 8 : 19-21). "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power withstandeth the ordinance of God," (Rom.

13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13-17). "Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh: fearing the Lord," (Col. 3:22). These Scriptures teach, (1) That God made man to be the intelligent ruler of the earth, and its forces. (2) That all moral and spiritual authority and power are committed to man. As he uses it so will the world be. (3) That the physical world is waiting for man to deliver it from the power of corruption. It shall partake of man's glory, as it has groaned under his debasement. (4) Obedience to human authority and laws is regarded as a mark of godliness. Therefore this world is what man has made it. Its possibilities are unlimited. What is called the providence of God, may not improperly be designated the achievements of man. God has given man talents and abilities for the accomplishment of divine purposes. As he uses one talent God enlarges his opportunities for greater and higher responsibilities. God's grace, Spirit and power accompany man; and this divine help goes also to human credit; for man works with divine instruments.

God's appointment of man as the governor of this world does not imply that God has abdicated the throne. His grace and presence are assured unto the moral governor of the world.

As a governor great responsibility has been laid on man. Responsibility implies a free agent. God has fully recognized man's free agency, and has in no way hedged him about with necessity. God asks man to learn the divine law, and enforce it in human government. Thereby the world will be governed according to the will of God. But man is free to reject that law and pattern of divine conduct, and substitute anything therefor, which in his judgment will carry out his worldly purposes. This rejection may be contrary to the divine will, yet it accords with man's freedom. Any disaster or failure following such choice must not be attributed to God, but to man alone. If man should follow God's law and fail the responsibility will be with God.

Man is a finite being, limited in all his faculties and powers. But God's infinite powers are in reserve, and man can call upon them to aid in the accomplishment of his commission as ruler

of the world. God holds the infinitude of his grace before man and gives freely, so that man lacks in nothing as an intelligent and moral governor.

The fall has not changed God's gracious disposition towards man; neither has it changed God's ultimate purpose concerning the world and men's relation to it, *e. g.*, God sanctified the Sabbath in Eden, and afterwards declares that the Sabbath was made for man, being a sinner. Therefore, whatever provision of grace man could depend upon as the governor of the world in his innocence, is still reserved and readily given. God's favor, wisdom and presence are assured for the preservation of the whole creation. Nature's laws fulfil their ordained functions. God's presence and power are in reserve for the highest development of the world's powers and capacities. Further, God does not wait for man's asking, but gives as his wisdom dictates. These gifts as received enlarge man's powers for ruling the world wisely.

Man is free to accept God's help or refuse it. He is free to accept any other suggestion, that may commend itself to his judgment. He realizes that his knowledge and powers are limited. God's reserves are open and given, but it is in human power to restrain God and prevent his mighty help, (Matt. 13:58).

There are three free intellectual moral agencies at work in this world. God is free, he made man in his own likeness. Therefore, man is free. No power can enslave God. The devil also is a free being, though it be asserted "that Satan is subject to the power of God, and so governed by his control that he is compelled to render obedience to him," (Calvin's Institutes 1, 14, 17). How can Satan be free under such circumstances. Is he an obedient adversary? We assert, that he is free, and uses his liberty as freely as God or man. Neither of these free beings can enslave the other, without destroying the freedom of his victim. God cannot take away a man's freedom without depriving him of responsibility. Then God would become responsible for the acts of man, and not man himself. "God does not change the nature of the agents, or the manner and order of their action, but he permits natural agents to act naturally, free agents to act freely," (Quenstedt, Schmid's Dogmatic, 204). "With

free agents God concurs variously, leaving to them their free decision, and the free power to choose this or that; for the order that God has once established he does not easily change," (Hollaz. Schmid.)

It has been asserted that God could have prevented sin, and the evils resulting therefrom. Has God the power to take away from man that which he himself holds as the most precious attribute of divinity? His dynamic power must not be made to conflict with moral power. God is free. If he deprives man of freedom, he becomes a usurper of man's throne. Then Satan would hurl a truth at God of usurping the most precious rights of a free being. Therein God must deny his own holiness if he would prevent man from the exercise of perfect liberty. Bancroft says, "It is a crime to enslave the human understanding, under the pretense of protecting religion," (Hist. U. S., Vol. I., 361).

Necessity has no place in God's government, except as it touches his own person. When he lays a necessity upon man it binds him with the chains of fatalism, and transfers the responsibility of man's deeds upon God. If "might makes right" be true, then (God being omnipotent) all responsibility for the presence of evil in the world must rest with him. If he does not choose to exercise his power, his will is not benevolent. Necessitarianism will land us in atheism or ungodliness. "Right is with the heaviest battalions" may be Napoleonic, but not divine.

The devil cannot enslave man, and thereby take away his liberty, (Jas. 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:9). Man is the responsible governor of the world. His fall did not deprive him of that dominion. God holds *him* responsible. If the devil had enslaved man, God would err in punishing the slave instead of the master.

One free being can unite with another free being in a co-partnership. God and Satan are at eternal enmity. One cannot have any part or association with the other, save resistance and war. Man is free to choose the advice of God or the devil. God cannot frustrate that choice without depriving him of choice.

"What God absolutely wills not, but on the contrary hates and punishes, he could not wholly have prevented without annihilating that human freedom willed and conferred by himself." (Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, 341). The dilemma of Epicurus meets the thoughtful man to-day, viz., "If God is willing to remove evil, and not able, he must be weak. If he is able and not willing he must be envious. If he is neither willing nor able, he must be both envious and weak. If he is both willing and able whence then proceeds evil? Or why does he not remove it?" This reasoning is based on false premises. It infers that advantage and utility are the ground of right. If God should use almighty power against a weaker being, he might be chargeable with injustice and unfairness. Right is right upon its own grounds and that everywhere. What is right for the creature must be right for the Creator. If God can compel man or the devil to do right without a desire to obey, then the devil or the strong man may compel a weaker one to obedience, and be following God's example. Fatalism cannot rid itself of the charge, that God's omnipotence may antagonize justice and benevolence. God is one and there can be no other. Neither can one attribute supercede another. Therefore man chooses the devil or God, as the argument of one or the other commands itself to his judgment. The choice of man's partnership with the devil, expels God from the intellectual and moral world. But if man chooses God the devil must be expelled.

Under such a free government, God is not responsible for any evil, neither is he a silent partner with it. "When we say that Satan resists God, and that his works are contrary to the works of God, we at the same time assert that this repugnance and contention depend on the divine permission," (Calvin's Institutes 1, 14, 17). This doctrine of a divine permission of evil does not release God from the moral responsibility of evil. If God permits the devil or wicked men to afflict the righteous, he cannot escape the accusation that he and the devil have conspired together against man; or for his own purposes permitted the devil to afflict so that he might get glory out of the conflict. All moral ideas revolt against such righteousness. If God permits

the devil to do evil, he then and there co-operates with his and man's enemy, which is a violation of his own law. "Resist the devil and he will flee from you" was practiced and realized by Jesus Christ in the temptation. It is a divine command. Shall it be charged that God by any act, or failure to act, or by consent should place himself where "the father of lies" is? Would not the apostolic command required us to resist God also? "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted from ($\alpha\pi\tau\sigma$) God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempteth no man" (Jas. 1 : 13). "He that doeth sin is of the devil," (1 John 3 : 8). Nothing but a misapprehension of the divine government, and of revelation, would make God a silent partner with the devil in the infliction of evil. He is not responsible for evil in any form, or by implication. The devil is the author of evil, and enters into partnership with man to do evil. The XIX article of the Augustana was framed "expressly for the purpose of denying the divine causation of sin," when it says, "The cause of sin is the will of the wicked; to wit, of the devil and ungodly men," (Dr. Krauth's Translation). All evils in the world are attributable to one or other of these sources. God can only prevent such evils by usurping the throne of earthly freedom, and thus set up a dominion of fatalism.

II. Divine providence makes no compromise with evil. That there are evils in the world cannot be denied. "The optimist avers, that could we occupy a sufficiently comprehensive standpoint, and overlook the whole course of human life and history, the evil that exists, together with the death that reigns amid so much pain and disorder, would be found to contribute to the highest happiness and well-being of the whole," (LUTH. QUAR., 1884, p. 431). Therefore, what we call evils are only apparent, and they are working out the highest good for, and in all the world. Then God would be the author of all the moral and physical calamities which torture and distress the inhabitants of the earth, and that he does these things for their highest good. Let this thought be examined. The thunderstorm purifies the atmosphere, but in its progress, a bolt crashes to the earth, striking where it may, and a man or beast is killed. That destruc-

tion is an evil. Man's moral sense declares it so. God's law makes such acts criminal. Man dare not kill his fellow-man, either through malice or accident. How may God or his providence do what he himself forbids?

We note the following as axiomatic propositions:

Whatever is right in one part of the universe of God cannot be wrong in any other part, and vice versa.

Any law that God ordained for the government of man, he must observe himself.

Law is designed for the harmony of God's government, and he cannot break that harmony.

No righteous governor dare punish a subject without giving a reason for such punishment.

Punishment for transgression without distinct warning is cruel, and unworthy of a moral government.

These propositions are applicable to each and every part of God's government. Physical evils are closely allied with moral evils, often following as a result of immorality. Physical penalties cannot atone for moral delinquencies, but often follow as cause and effect. The moral intention precedes the wicked act. An unintentional or accidental evil cannot be attributed to God, or any of his acts. His government of the universe must not conflict with any law governing a part thereof. From this we would conclude that earthquakes, floods, storms, epidemics and personal calamities do not have their origin in God's government. May not these things be visited upon communities and individuals as punishment for particular sins? We think not, unless God should send a messenger to designate the particular acts which incur divine displeasure. Otherwise his rule would be that of an autocrat who disregards the liberty of free beings.

Evil antagonizes divine providence. God is displeased with sin or disobedience, because divine law is violated. If sin is displeasing to God none of its results can be pleasing in his sight. Moral evils are not only displeasing to God, but they are active in seeking to dethrone him from place in the moral world. The ungodly man may take pride in his honesty and

integrity, and say, "Lord, I know that thou art a hard man, reaping and gathering my hard earned harvests." This is the plea of selfishness. It wants God excluded from the earth.

Physical evils are not less antagonistic to divine providence. Reverse the order. Jesus devoted much time to healing of the sick, and restoring the defects and abnormal conditions of the human body. His commission to the Church and disciples was to heal the sick, (Mark 16:18; Jas. 5:15). Divine providence has nothing to do with causing sickness, sorrow, pain and death. But it is the desire of God that these evils shall be removed. The devil has the power of death, and Christ came to destroy the devil and his power, and to deliver man from bondage, *i. e.*, physical bondage, (Heb. 2:14, 15).

God in no way does evil or permits evil. There is no necessity for drawing distinctions between moral and physical evils. If a free being sins, he is responsible for the deed and its consequences. If God has ordained a law by which evil shall be visited upon man without knowledge or warning, he must be responsible for the consequences of that law. He has plainly declared that he will hold man guilty under similar circumstances. Luther was disposed to refer all evil to the spirits of darkness. He says, "The heathen know not whence evil so suddenly comes. But we know. It is the pure work of the devil; who has firebrands, bullets, torches, spears and swords, with which he shoots, casts or pierces, when God permits. Therefore let no man doubt when fire breaks out which consumes a village or house, that a little devil is sitting there blowing the fire, to make it greater," (Walch Ed., Vol. X., 1234). The logic for the divine perfections would lead to no other conclusion.

The divine government has its limits. God has arranged them. God cannot enslave man, neither can he enslave the devil. He would thereby be a violator of the rights he conferred on all free beings. His plan is, to work out, through man, the purposes he had from the beginning. He proposes a sufficiency of grace, but in no case to set man's agency aside. When Satan buffeted Paul with a thorn in the flesh the apostle

prayed thrice that it might depart from him. But the answer was, "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my power is made perfect in weakness." Satan exercises his power against man, and God his power for man. Man can lay hold of either hand of power.

What is true of the individual, is true also of society. The whole human family, or the ruling element of society can take hold of God's truth and power, and rule the world for him, or, like Ahab, can lay hold upon satanic power, and involve the whole social fabric in misery and ruin. If man and the devil combine together, they can and do expel God from their dominion. Then the devil takes advantage of his opportunity, and his host of evil-doers, demons and wicked men, with unrestrained license, destroy and devastate the land. He is the father of lies and all evil. A wretched family is in power. When God is expelled, hell and its realites are on the earth. God and his law tend to peace, while the evil is lawless and a destroyer. Is there any necessity for God to interfere, and become a co-destroyer, among that ungovernable host? Nay. Men may remember the reign of peace and how God directed their paths. They can call upon God to return. They give Christ his true place to destroy the works of the devil, (1 Jno. 3:8).

A free choice is given and maintained. "Man is not an inevitable slave of the adversary. The devil can have no absolute control over him. He cannot coerce his will, nor compel his vassalage. Man has the same ability to resist temptation to evil that he has to yield to the motives of virtue," (LUTH. QUAR., 1878, 566).

Chemnitz defines "providence as a general action of God by which he is present with the creature, sustaining and preserving it, as long as he wishes it to be preserved; and preserves the order of his work appointed by himself, not by fatal necessity, but as a most free agent, so that for the sake of man, he controls all things, and moderates, changes, and hinders many with respect to second causes," (Schmid, Dogmatic, 213).

The question of physical evil is before us. God has so constituted this world that all things shall harmonize with his na-

ture and purpose. Can it be that he would thrust in the divine hand to break up or disarrange that harmony? Is he the violator of physical laws so that the earth heaves and trembles, or sends forth flood and destruction? Can it be that the benevolent Creator is the vindictive destroyer? Somewhere in God's dominions there is no violence and suffering. We are assured that it is his design that all the creation be governed by love. Love uses its powers to make the things of God to reflect his character. Love cannot destroy; nor can it use destructive methods to make room for a new creation. The physical world is in God's hands. He established its laws and will maintain them inviolate. Any derangement of the physical world must be in violation of God's law. Dr. McCosh says, "We must regard these supposed evils as following from the arrangements of heaven just as much as physical blessings. We must see God in the hurricane as well as in the gentler breezes—in the floods as well as the softer shower—in the scorching drought as well as in the genial heat—in disease as well as in health, so far as these evils are merely physical, or bear a physical aspect, or are connected with some other physical phenomena, they are not evil," (Div. Gov. 258). We might designate this as a philosophy of ignorance. If man does not know good from evil, and cannot know the moral quality of actions or phenomena outside of himself, then truly, he should not be held responsible for acts which injure others. If nature is not plain enough to be understood, man is in a pitiable condition. God has declared certain acts wrong and worthy of punishment. They are violations of his law. The disciples cried out, "Lord, save us, we perish;" "Then Jesus arose and rebuked the wind and the sea." Did Jesus rebuke the arrangements of God or physical laws? Jesus and God did harmonize in thought and deed. God's relation to the physical world can be known by Jesus' conduct towards men. He is not a destroyer, but a continual benefactor.

It is not true that God must do evil, or what has an appearance of evil, that good may come. Evil is not a means of cleansing, or renovating the derangements of nature. Two evils

cannot make one good; nor can the multiplication of evils produce good results. God forms no alliances with evil, that he may thereby expel the powers of evil from the earth. Neither does he complacently delegate agencies to carry out his righteous will.

The laws of matter and of mind, as God established them, were all very good, and tended only to good. The devil perverts, and instigated by him man abuses these laws, and here the evil lies. The only remedy is the restoration of good. If the devil is the instigator of evil, his power must be broken. God's benevolence must heal the breach.

God does not smite man, but uses his powers to save man. He does not visit judgments as punishments without warning the transgressor, that his conduct must be visited with its just deserts. The judgments visited upon rebellious Israel and their oriental neighbors, were preceded by prophetic warning. Noah preached while building the ark. Jonah was sent to warn Nineveh, "Son of man I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth and warn them from me," (Ezek. 33:7). Jeremiah told how to avert the overthrow of Jerusalem and the captivity in Babylon. "One wicked man is often employed to punish another. This feature of the divine government comes out strikingly in Hebrew history. Jereboam is employed to punish the house of David; Omri is raised up to punish the house of Jereboam; Jehu is sent to avenge evil wrought by Omri. This method is observable throughout the whole economy of God's providence, as revealed in the sacred volume. Egypt, Nineveh, Babylon and Persia are made instruments of punishing the Jews, and were themselves punished for the evil they wrought," (McCosh, Div. Gov., 433). This language does not discriminate clearly. God did not send or lead them as he led Israel. We must observe the manner of these providential punishments. Israel had expelled God. Their jealous neighbors took advantage of their rebellious state. They soon observed that Israel lacked their wonderful power, viz., the divine presence. Yet God's watchful eye noted every ill that his faithless people suffered.

Take notice of the action of St. Paul; having the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, he delivered the incestuous man "unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved," (1 Cor. 5:5). Concerning those who made shipwreck of faith, "of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander whom I delivered unto Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme." When men have refused God's truth and admonitions, they are given over to Satan, that with him they may learn what they have chosen and lost. We see in these and other instances man's government and punishment of others to teach them the way of righteousness.

Let us note this fact: every judgment was preceded by the messenger of God. It is not reasonable nor just that men or society should be punished for sin without a knowledge of that specific sin. There is no opportunity given now as to Nineveh, to repent or remedy the evil. Was the Chicago fire, the Charleston earthquake, the Johnstown flood, or the Hamburg cholera scourge a punishment for the special wickedness of that city? Think ye they were sinners above all the cities of this generation? "I tell you, Nay," (Luke 13:2-5). Jesus negatives the question. Why will our generation continue to teach that calamities are divine judgments? We are reminded that the Scriptures have answered the assertions of superstition. The careful study of the Bible will make havoc with many theological notions concerning providence. Let us exalt the word and let our opinion be conformed to divine truth and the divine mind. Our God is not an adversary but a loving Father, suffering to save men. The New Testament sets God's disposition towards sinners in the clearest light.

"Evil did not originate with man. There is therefore a judgment of evil, which precedes the judgment of man. Sin came into man's work, and death by sin, not by God. So far from this crowning evil being an act of God, it is called the last enemy to be destroyed. Christ is continually represented as victor over death, and certainly as such he is no victor over the Father's will and act. Taking therefore the extremest form of physical

evil, it is not the act of God, but the result of departure from him, and the immediate act of the devil," (Prof. Campbell's Defense before Montreal Presbytery, Sept., 1893).

The infliction of physical evil is the work of the devil. "Ought not this woman whom Satan bound these eighteen years be loosed." There are diseases, calamities, and suffering in the world, but not of God. "The thief cometh not but for to steal, and to kill and to destroy; I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

That physical and moral evils are not divine judgments is plainly declared. Jesus Christ is the revealer of the Father in his person, words and works. He said, "If any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world," (John 12 : 47). "Ye judge after the flesh: I judge no man," (John 8 : 15). Judgment leads to condemnation, "God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world: but that the world should be saved through him," (John 3 : 17). In the last judgment, the royal judge is the Son of Man. "The person of the Godhead who will judge the quick and the dead, is the Son, and he will be so, not as the Son of God, but as the Son of Man," (Prof. Campbell's Defense, see also Dr. E. V. Gerhart, *Hom. Rev.*, 1893). If Jesus, the Christ, holds such position we may be assured that judgments are not being executed on men and nature. When he saw what was awaiting Jerusalem in the near future he wept. Wept because of God's providence? Did Jesus stand at antipode with God? It cannot be. He wept because Jerusalem refused divine providence.

The preconceived ideas of the translators of the New Testament must have influenced their interpretation of *παιδεύω* and *παιδεία* in Heb. 12 : 5-11, using the words "chasten" and "chastisement." Do they mean to say that Jesus completes our faith by means of persecutions and tribulations, making them means of grace? And that sufferings made the worthies mentioned in Chap. xi, what they were, and not faith? In 2 Tim. 2 : 25; Titus 2 : 12, and 1 Tim. 1 : 20, *παιδεύω* is translated to teach or instruct when it is done by man. Such authorities

as Liddell and Scott, Donnegan, Robinson, Young and others define *παιδεύω*, to train or rear a child, hence to educate or lead a child. This is the idea conveyed by the word. Why learned and conscientious men will use divine revelation to accommodate their ideas of divine government is inexplicable. If Timothy and Titus are exhorted to instruct, God can instruct children also. We offer a literal translation of these verses and confess that it differs widely from the authorized and revised versions. "My son, regard not lightly the instruction of the Lord, nor faint being convinced by him. For whom the Lord loveth he instructeth, and correcteth every son whom he receiveth. If ye remain under [his] instruction, God conducteth himself toward you as toward sons. For what son is he whom a father doth not instruct? If ye are without instruction, of which all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons. So then we had the fathers of the flesh who instructed [us] for our profit, and we respected them; shall we not much rather be obedient to the Father of spirits and live? For they indeed for a few days instructed us as seemed good to them; but he [instructed us] for our profit, that we may partake of his holiness. All instruction for the present seemeth not to be joyous, but grievous; yet afterward it yieldeth peaceable fruit to them who are exercised thereby, even of righteousness." When speaking of slaves, prisoners or disobedient children *παιδεία* may be used in the sense of "chastisement." The writer of Hebrews is commanding the obedient in the time of their severe trial at the hands of God's enemies and their enemies. Yet our translators would make it appear that the Lord is the author of their trials. The LXX translate יְסַד with *παιδεύω*, showing that God is an instructor rather than a chastiser throughout the whole Bible. We are not forcing Scripture to our view, but presenting it in strict consistency with all the teachings of God.

III. The Christ was manifested to the world for the overthrow and destruction of evil. But the removal of evil from the world will only be in so far as man desires it. God does not ask man to coöperate with him, but offers the divine coöperation to man.

Man's dominion in the world is still his own. Under the power of sin he ruled the world with devastation and ruin. Christ, the Redeemer, took the guilt and power of sin upon himself and triumphed over it. He now comes to man with all the authority and power of heaven, and confers them upon him. He justifies man before God, and gives him peace and joy and hope. Since peace is established in his own mind, he goes forth under the divine commission to restore the human family to union with, and confidence in, God. As he feels his helplessness for the performance of this task, he calls upon God for wisdom and guidance. God is not held from us by inexorable law, but is free to give whatsoever man may desire. Prayer has its place and significance in the divine economy.

Man chooses God, and his wisdom and power, to aid in governing the world. Whatever is done or accomplished under this humano-divine partnership, is according to the original commission to man, to replenish the earth, and make it fruitful. This co-partnership is a most powerful moral force against evil. By it man searches out the hidden powers of the earth, and uses them to overcome the hindrances and powers of evil. Scientific research has developed wonderful powers for man's wise government of the world. It enables man to avert and overcome many physical evils. A recent writer says, that "one remarkable result of Christianity is that it diminishes the physical ills of nations. The sway of England over India is fast rendering famine impossible." Many diseases are becoming submissive to the specialists' skill. The wonderful inventions of our day move along with Christianity. The name of the inventor or discoverer is conscientiously accredited. The progress of the world is, under God, man's deeds. Man's religious power is manifested in society, and his scientific power manifests itself over the material world. The history of Christendom is the history of providence. Where man denies God, the world does not improve. But Christianity is aggressive. It aims to hold sway over the whole world.

Our modern civilization is the growth of historical Christianity. It has developed reverence for law, so that government is not a

thing of force, but a hearty obedience. An estimate is put upon individual rights and liberties, which have grown along side of religious progress. Christianity teaches man to respect the life of another. Society is constructed upon a higher plane, and the world realizes a providence.

This war against evil is waged under the power of the Holy Spirit. We understand that the prerogative of the Holy Spirit is to quicken man, and make him a power to subdue sin and the world. Then it is truly a warfare. Man's hatred against sin is as deep and violent as God's. He has learned of God. He appreciates his deliverance from the bondage of sin. As he realizes his obligation to God he seeks to expel sin from the world, thereby fashioning the world after the pattern of God. As man receives the Spirit of God his hatred of sin becomes more earnest, and his love of righteousness also burns; then he puts forth every power that the world may learn righteousness and hate iniquity. Man takes this as his watchword, and will not cease till he has made this world a kingdom of God.

Why is not this warfare against evil made general? Men are slow to give up prejudices and notions that are woven in the social fabric. Just as much as man chooses God, and not the selfish ways of sin, so much will he be a hater of evil, and will hurl his thunderbolts into the camp of evil. We have firm footing when the character of man rises to the character of God, and when the desires of God become the desires of man.

God's purposes and designs are not changed, though man sinned and opened the flood-gates of evil upon this earth. God patiently taught and made known his will. He set his plans, and called upon man to carry them into effect. God's purposes will be gained though they come through fire. He leads a man here and there to see his wonderful purpose. Each of these seeks to persuade his fellow till they are now numbered by the million. All of them do not yet see the full purpose of God. But as they realize that purpose they become enthusiasts in his cause. God is now working along with a mighty host for the suppression of evil, and the renovation of the whole earth from the influence and power of the devil.

God in the end will triumph. His triumph will be man's triumph. In no case from the beginning to the end of the conflict has God coerced man, nor interfered with his personal freedom. God has dealt with him as an intelligent being. He committed the most sacred trusts into human hands, to be used according to human judgment. The devil's defeat is alone attributed to man's desertion of him and his methods. Man was deceived and turned away from God, and lost Paradise. Man's eyes are opened to divine truth and turns away from sin and restores Paradise again to the earth.

A Theodicy is practicable. It is well established. The divine perfections have not suffered because of evil. God has ruled through human agency. He has never denied man's part, but accredits him with all that is or shall be accomplished. Evil is and shall be expelled from the earth by human agency. But for the efficiency of that agency divine power is at his disposal. He uses it and conquers. Christ has triumphed and saved men from their sins; and men through him have triumphed over the powers of evil. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God."

ARTICLE VI.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHES.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession there is a growing conviction that in many respects we do not understand each other, and that our peace is often disturbed by imputations that are false and by consequent criminations and recriminations that are needless. In our estimation there is some ground for such an opinion. We are indeed far from thinking that misunderstandings are the source of all our troubles. There are real differences and disagreements among us. But often there is a

failure to determine with clearness and precision the point of difference, and the disagreement issues in vague and therefore unprofitable controversy. And that is not the worst of it, though that is bad enough. The dispute is thus apt to become a personal affair, in which the honor of the disputant is of chief moment, the uncharitable aspersion of the antagonist seems justifiable, and the whole becomes a scandalous quarrel in which the glory of God, though with Christians it should always be the principal concern, is entirely overlooked, and the interests of truth, by which alone the glory of God and the saving of souls is promoted, are set aside and disregarded. Undoubtedly it would be of great value to us all if we would fully understand each other, and, where a real difference becomes apparent, clearly define the point and in a Christian spirit seek to learn the mind of the Lord and thus to adjust the difference. As matters now stand among us there are two difficulties to contend with where only one, if any, is necessary : there are imputations and inferences from them that provoke personal hostility, in addition to the disagreements in doctrine and practice. If we cannot agree in regard to what the Holy Spirit teaches in his infallible word, let us at least understand one another, and not "so fight as one that beateth the air."

Convinced that not a few of the dissensions which have arisen among us have their root in divergent views on the doctrine of the Church, we design this essay to be a contribution towards a better understanding of the subject, at least so far as the import and implications of Lutheran practice are concerned. In treating of the Church and the Churches we have no desire to provoke controversy. We write rather in the interest of peace, believing that much of the strife and contention among us results from the imputations to each other of principles and purposes that are not entertained, and that harmony is often made impossible by the wrongs which are done under a misconception of the whole question at issue. Let us understand one another ; let us do each other no wrong. That will promote peace and harmony, even if we do not at once fully agree. In that spirit we desire to discuss the subject before us, and to do this with all

the plainness and all the frankness at our command, that all misunderstanding may be as much as possible avoided.

I. In the oldest creed of Christendom the Holy Christian Church is set forth as one of the prime articles of the Christian faith. With this the Evangelical Lutheran Church is heartily in accord, as she is with the whole congregation of believers in all time and in every respect, not only cordially accepting the Apostles' Creed as the declaration of her own faith, but in various places of her other Confessions reiterating and emphasizing her belief that there is and always shall be "one holy church," which "is properly the congregation of saints and true believers."

1. Of this Church Christ alone is the Founder and Builder and Head. "For by him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord : in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit," Eph. 2 : 18-22. He purchased the Church with his own blood, Acts 20 : 28. He gave the commission to go into all the world and make disciples among all nations ; for to him all power is given in heaven and upon earth, and he is present always even unto the end of the world, Matt. 28 : 18-20. "The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved," Acts 2 : 47." "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves : it is the gift of God ; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Eph. 2 : 8-10. Therefore "unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen," Eph. 3 : 20, 21. "He is the head of the body, the Church : who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preeminence," Col. 1,; 18. The holy

Christian Church is the kingdom of Christ, who purchased it with his blood, unites the members in one body by his grace, and rules over it by his word. Human power and judgment and authority have nothing to do with its establishment and government. It has come into being and continues to exist and to grow exclusively by the grace of our Lord.

2. He builds and prospers the Church by the Holy Spirit through the means of grace. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd," John 10 : 16. Not only his sheep of the Jewish fold shall live under him in his kingdom, but millions from the Gentile world shall be gathered into the one body and forever enjoy the Saviour's love and adore the Saviour's name. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," Gal. 3 : 28. All are made one in Christ by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit exerted in the word which is preached and the sacraments which are administered. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," Rom. 8 : 9. "Jesus answered, verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John 5 : 5. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," John 6 : 53. "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." Human devices and expedients, human learning and eloquence are not the power by which souls are saved and the Church is built. Only the Holy Spirit can do this, and it pleases the Lord of the Church that it should be done by his appointed means of grace. "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, or come to him; but the Holy Ghost has called me by the gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true

faith; even as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and keeps it in Jesus Christ in the one true faith."

3. In this one Church there is an indispensable condition of membership fixed by the Lord himself. It is the congregation of saints, or of true believers. The faith of the heart is necessary, and nothing else is necessary. That is the only test. "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," John 3 : 35, 36. "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe," Gal. 3 : 22. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God," 1 John 5 : 1. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," Gal. 3 : 28. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark 16 : 15, 16. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God," Rom. 5 : 1, 2. Nothing else is necessary for membership in Christ's body and salvation through him. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," Rom. 3 : 28. "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast," Eph. 2 : 8, 9. And this faith invites all to Christ and makes the believers one body in him. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism," Eph. 4 : 4, 5. The Holy Ghost is constantly doing his saving work where the gospel is preached and the holy sacraments are administered. Faith is wrought in the souls of men, and believers are added to the Church daily.

4. This test of church membership is always applied with infallible certainty and without exception or variation. It is the Lord's own rule, revealed to us for our learning and warning,

and comfort, but not for man's guidance in making judicial decisions as to what persons shall and what persons shall not be admitted into the congregation of believers. The Lord has not committed such decisions to us: he has reserved it to himself. When an individual has faith in his soul, he is in the congregation of believers, whatever men may think or say. The one essential condition is then fulfilled and the Lord receives him. He is a member of Christ's body because he is united to Christ by faith. Considerations that may be of great moment and that must needs be taken into account when the conditions and circumstances are such as to require mutual recognition of brethren, have no place here. A believer is a member of the Church, whether others know him to be a believer or not. "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his," 2 Tim. 2 : 19. That knowledge is in no manner and in no degree dependent on men's judgments, favorable or unfavorable. On the other hand, when a person resists the Holy Ghost and remains in unbelief, he is not a member of the Lord's body, the communion of saints, though all men should be deceived by his pious pretences. The Lord decides the matter of church fellowship, and he never deviates from the rule and never makes mistakes in its application. It is absurd to suppose that he must first examine whether a person has complied with all the forms and ceremonies and regulations that are in vogue among the churches before he can recognize him as a member of his Church. He requires faith as the condition, and nothing more. If one has this, he is a member, whether he externally belong to the Lutheran, or Reformed, or Romish Church, or to no external church organization at all; if he has not this, he is not a member, though he be of the highest standing in the Lutheran or in any other church. External relations and appearances cannot decide who belongs to the congregation of believers. Faith is the only test, and the Lord, who sees into the hearts of men, alone can apply it. The Church is essentially invisible.

5. The Church, as to its essence, must therefore of necessity be an article of faith, as the Apostles' Creed presents it. Not

only is it composed of believers, and of these exclusively, but it is a spiritual body of whose existence only believers can have certainty, because they only can have the assurance of faith. What we can see is never, as far as we can see it and know it by sense, an object of faith, in the scriptural sense of that word. It is true, we speak of believing on the authority of our senses. We believe this paper to be white because we see it. But faith in its biblical import "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," Heb. 11 : 1. "We walk by faith, not by sight," 2 Cor. 5 : 7. If we could see who are the members of the Church and thus recognize it by our senses wherever it appears on earth, it would not be an object of faith: sight would be all-sufficient to discern it. But we cannot thus know where it is or whether it exists on earth at all or not. For aught that we can know by sight, all who profess to be Christians at any place or in every place may be mere hypocrites. We cannot see who among those that profess faith in Christ are really believers, and who are not. The Church is invisible in its essence: what we see is not that which forms its true nature and properly constitutes it. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you," Luke 17 : 20, 21. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house," 1 Pet. 2 : 5. But it does not follow from this that man cannot know the existence of the Church on earth at all. He cannot know it by sight, for it is a spiritual house. But he can know it by faith, which is the divinely wrought sense for spiritual objects. "We are speaking," says the Apology (ch. iv., §20) "not of an imaginary Church, which is to be found nowhere, but we say and know certainly that this Church, wherein saints live, is and abides truly upon earth; namely, that some of God's children are here and there in all the world, in various kingdoms, islands, lands and cities, from the rising of the sun to its setting, who have truly learned to know Christ and his gospel. And we add the marks, "the pure doctrine of the gospel and the sacraments." When these means of grace are administered some will be regenerated by the Holy Spirit who works through them, and there

will thus be some believers. But only to faith can this be a sufficient evidence. Not the witness of our sense that there are people in any given place who profess to be Christians, or that these professing Christians have the ministry among them, gives us certainty that there are believers there. We do not see the faith that embraces Christ, and that is the one essential thing. A man may preach the gospel and a man may confess the gospel without in his heart believing it. But the word of God does not fail. "Though the Church be properly the congregation of saints and true believers, yet, seeing that in this life many hypocrites and evil persons are mingled with it, it is lawful to use the sacraments administered by evil men, according to the voice of Christ. 'The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat,' and the words following, (Matt. 23 : 2). And the sacraments and the word are effectual by reason of the institution and commandment of Christ, though they be delivered by evil men," (Augsb. Conf. Art. VIII). It is the promise of God that renders us sure. "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it, Isa. 55 : 10, 11. He that does not believe such promises can have no certainty that there is a church, a congregation of true believers, anywhere on earth.

6. The Church in its essential nature is one, and it retains that unity notwithstanding all the external dissensions and divisions among those who profess to be true believers. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism," Eph. 4 : 4, 5. No wisdom and no folly of man can change the foundation which God has laid or the spiritual house which God has built. Whenever believers assemble and whenever they undertake to work in the Lord's name, human infirmity and sin may be expected to appear; for these believers are but sinful men, though saints through faith in the Lamb of God that taketh away the

sin of the world: and not all who meet and join in the work are really believers. There may be jealousies and disputes, there may be schisms and sects, there may be hypocrisies and apostasies, but through all the external troubles the one Church of Christ remains, the congregation of true believers whom the Lord unerringly knows as his people. It is a sad thing that there are so many divisions among Christians, and that instead of presenting a united front against all the foes of Christ and of the salvation which is alone in him, they turn their weapons against each other. Sin is a dreadful thing. But it need not, since God in his infinite mercy has provided eternal salvation for men, drive us to despair. He helps us in our infirmity and comforts us in our tribulation. His work goes on, notwithstanding all men's errings, and his Church stands firm and glorious, notwithstanding all men's foolish efforts to build it better or to break it down. The Church remains the one communion of saints, which external envyings and strifes and separations cannot rend. "I believe that there is upon earth a holy assembly and congregation of pure saints, under one head, even Christ, called together by the Holy Ghost in one faith, one mind and understanding, with manifold gifts, yet one in love, without sects or schisms," Large Cat. II., 51. The division among Christians that trouble us so much are all divisions in the Church as it appears to men on earth, not in the Church as it essentially is before the eyes of God. The Church is in its essence the same body of Christ, the same congregation of believers, one and undivided, as it would be if external divisions had never occurred and did not now exist in the visible organization. All true believers are still united in the one body of true saints and believers, which is the Holy Christian Church.

7. In this holy Church all sincere believers, of whatever name, have eternal, spiritual fellowship with each other. They are all united by the one bond of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, which joins them to him and in him to one another. There is thus a communion or fellowship of all true believers in the one body of Christ, even if externally they are separated not only locally or geographically, but doctrinally or by reason of dis-

gements and divisions in organization. "Neither pray I for these alone," says our blessed Lord, "but for them also which shall believe on me by their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they all may be one in us," John 17 : 20, 21. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," 1 John 1 : 7. Believers, in virtue of the one faith which the same Spirit has wrought in their hearts and by which they cling to the same Saviour and are children of the same Father, are all members of the same body. "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular," 1 Cor. 12 : 27. In the words of Baier: "The form of the Church, or the formal essence, through which this congregation of men is constituted the Church properly so called, consists in the union of true believers and saints with Christ by true and living faith. This is not an external and local union of bodies, but an internal and spiritual union of souls. For although believers also have local sacred assemblies, these are not of the essence of the Church," Theol. Pas. III., cap. 13, 9. Faith is the only qualification for membership and fellowship in the one Church of Christ, and the Lord who alone seeth the heart decides who are believers, and thus of the Church, and who are not. With that decision men have nothing to do. It would be preposterous for sinful mortals to claim the right of meddling with the Lord's prerogatives and in pursuance of such arrogance to set up an external test of internal fellowship in the invisible Church, whether that test be subjection to the pope or to the episcopate, acceptance of a prescribed method of conversion or mode of baptism, adoption of certain regulations for dress or diet, or any other outward sign or mark. Not even the commandments of our Lord, absolutely binding as they are recognized to be by all Christians, can serve as such a criterion, because the one essential requisite is a thing of the heart, which no man can see. The Lord sees it, and that is enough. Those who believe in Christ are all members of the one body and have internal fellowship with each other in the one Church of Christ, even though externally they are divided.

We trust that we have made our meaning plain. We do not think of claiming that anything external and visible constitutes the essence of the Church. The Lutheran doctrine excludes all such thoughts. They are not only erroneous, but mischievous in their influence on teaching and practice. But our presentation is not yet complete. The principal difficulties, so far as our present purpose is concerned, gather around another aspect of the subject.

II. There are churches, local and particular, of different denominations, some believers belonging to one, some to another, and some unbelievers belonging to each of them, as there is one universal Church of Christ, which is the congregation of all believers and to which no unbelievers belong.

1. The Church which the Holy Spirit has gathered is here on earth, and has here a holy mission to fulfill. The saving work of God is done in this world, and sinners saved by faith are honored with the privilege of being co-workers with God in publishing the tidings of salvation and making his praise glorious in all lands. They are witnesses of Christ's saving grace and they worship him in the beauty of holiness. To them are committed the means of grace, which they are to administer in their Redeemer's name for their own preservation in faith and for the increase of the body of Christ. Believers must manifest their presence in the world. They must confess the Lord that bought them, that others too may come to him, in whom alone is our help, and glorify his great name. "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." Rom. 10 : 8-11. That brings believers into the domain of the external and visible. And not only that. They must employ the audible and visible means by which the Holy Spirit regenerates and justifies the sinner and keeps the saint "by the power of God through faith

unto salvation." "Go ye therefore," saith our Lord, "and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28 : 19, 20. In doing this, and in making all needful provision for doing it faithfully and effectually, the believers come not before the eyes of all people. They of necessity become apparent in their divinely enjoined work and worship.

2. Thus visible churches are formed. Each individual believer cannot stand isolated from every other, but they necessarily associate together to satisfy the yearnings of their own souls and to execute the Lord's will as set forth in command and promise. "Having an High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised: and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another." Heb. 10 : 21-25. This was the rule from the beginning. The disciples were all with one accord in one place when the day of Pentecost was fully come, and when Peter preached the unsearchable riches of Christ to the people "they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Acts 2 : 41, 42. "And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." Acts 2 : 46, 47. A visible association is obviously meant when our Lord gives directions in regard to a trespassing brother on whom the private admonitions and entreaties of brethren have failed to

produce the designed effect: "If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Matt. 18 : 17-20. The believers, to whom are given the keys of the kingdom of heaven and who are the one holy Christian Church, are not all in one place and cannot all externally meet together; but those who are in the same locality must needs meet for the administration of the means of grace and for worship, calling pastors and making provision that everthing be done decently and in order. Such a congregation is the Church in that place, and, being a congregation of believers, has all the powers and privileges of the Church.

3. But the Church as it thus appears is not an adequate representation of the Church as it is in its essence. We do not here refer to the fact that not all the believers on earth are included in such a local organization. This is simply one of the churches, like "the church of God which is at Corinth," or the "churches of Galatia," to which St. Paul writes. No one would be likely to suppose that the term in such connection is meant to be used in its whole extension, implying that all believers have congregated in that locality. It is merely affirmed that there are believers there, and that thus that which is the essence of the Church is there. But a disturbing element is encountered when we endeavor to apply the conception to the facts. When believers associate to form a congregation some present themselves for membership, and some are actually received, who are not of the Church, because they are not believers. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea and gathered of every kind, which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away," Matt. 13 : 47, 48. "The kingdom of heaven is

like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son." "And when the king came in to see his guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment," Matt. 22 : 2, 11. The Church cannot appear in the world without exposing itself to human sin and the ignorance and weakness, the insincerity and deception, which sin brings with it. Some from other motives than those of faith in him and the desire to glorify his name will profess to be followers of Christ and seek membership in the visible Church. But they are not on that account properly members of Christ's body, though they may be regarded as such in man's judgment. "Christ also speaks of the outward appearance of the Church when he says, 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net,' likewise 'to ten virgins,' and he teaches that the Church has been covered by a multitude of evils, in order that this stumbling-block may not offend the pious; likewise, in order that we may know that the word and sacraments are efficacious even when administered by the wicked. And meanwhile he teaches that those godless men, although they have the fellowship of outward signs, are nevertheless not the true kingdom of Christ and members of Christ. They are members of the kingdom of the devil," (Apology, ch. iv., §19). Their outward association with believers does not deceive the Lord, who recognizes only believers as members of his body. But neither does the fact that these believers, when they externally unite in congregations, are brought into outward association with unbelievers, deprive them of the gifts and prerogatives which belong to the children of God. The unbelievers are not the Church and, when the word is taken in its strict sense, not a part of the Church. That which constitutes the Church is always only the believers, whether we regard it in its internal essence or in its external appearance. The whole visible congregation is called a church only in a synecdochical sense, just as we speak of a wheat field notwithstanding the tares that are growing in it. No one supposes that the tares are meant to be called wheat when the word is so applied, and no one should suppose that the unbelievers are meant to be called believers

when the body in which they are indistinguishably mingled is called a church.

4. In the visible Church, or the Church as it appears on earth, there should be unity, as there is unity in the Church invisible, or the Church as it is in its essence as the one congregation of true believers. This outward unity is not essential to the unity of the spiritual house which is the Church in the proper sense. Heresies and schisms do not divide the invisible body of Christ. The Church remains the one congregation of true believers or saints, in spite of all divisions which human infirmity and sin may effect in the outward organization. All believers are in it and all unbelievers are out of it, whatever men may think or say or do. The Lord alone decides who shall belong to it and who shall not, and he never excludes any that believe or includes any that do not believe. Divisions may endanger many a soul and lead some to make shipwreck of their faith, but they can never alter the condition and criterion of membership in the body of Christ. That will always be composed of true believers in Christ and only of these. Sects and schisms pertain only to the Church as, in its outward organization, it appears in the world. But it is the Lord's will that it should appear one, as it is really one. When believers in any locality organize to exercise the privileges and perform the duties which the Lord has committed to his Church, all other believers must respect the organization and promote its interests as the common interests of all Christians, or of the whole body of believers, and the establishment of another congregation that is not in fraternal harmony with it, and that would in any manner or degree interfere with its rights and offices as a church, would be a grave sin that hinders the peace and prosperity of the Lord's kingdom. All congregations, confessing the faith in virtue of which they are churches and living in love and peace with one another, should recognize each other as sister congregations, so that they would, in one spirit and with one aim, co-operate in the great work which the Lord has given his Church to do, and, as circumstances may require, form associations of congregations for the more effectual prosecution of this work. Thus the aggregate of visible churches would form one

visible body as there is in reality one holy Christian Church, which is the congregation of true believers, the communion of saints. "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment," 1 Cor. 1 : 11.

5. Divisions are sin: they can exist only in violation of the will of God. All who sincerely desire the welfare of Zion should see and recognize this. The theory which human reason has devised, that the separation of Christians into various particular churches or denominations without any bond of union between them is commendable, because the competition and rivalry which results from it incites the members to greater zeal and activity, is a delusion against which the souls of all believers should be closed. Divisions are sinful and operate perniciously. "I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them," Rom. 16 : 17. In man's fallen condition, unregenerated men mingling with believers in the visible church and regenerate men still having the flesh to contend with, sin will manifest itself in the form of faction and schism and heresy, as it will manifest itself in other forms; but it is sin, and remains sin, even when God overrules it for good to them that love him. "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you," 1 Cor. 11 : 19. Obviously the sin lies with those who cause the divisions contrary to the doctrine which the apostles preached, not with those who continue in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and who, obeying the divine command, avoid the schismatics and sectarians. Therefore the acceptance of the Scripture teaching, that causing a division is a sin does not decide which of the various existing denominations are the offending parties. That is a matter for further inquiry. But it certainly should move sincere Christians who exercise themselves to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men, to put the question with regard to their own denomination, whether its existence as a separate organization, coming into inevitable conflict with

churches previously existing, was or is now necessitated by the will and word of the Lord, so that it could not be avoided without sinning against the light which God gave by his word, or whether it was a plain violation of the apostolic entreaty, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that there be no divisions among you. In the former case the sin of the party that would not submit to the will and word of the Lord must be rebuked, and no fellowship with it is possible with a good conscience until it repents and puts away the sin. In the latter case, the denomination having caused divisions and offences contrary to the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, must repent and bring forth fruit meet for repentance by abandoning its sectarian peculiarities, or other Christians must apply the apostolic rule, "avoid them."

6. The basis upon which believers are to unite in congregations and upon which these are to recognize each other as sister congregations, is the revealed truth unto salvation which God has given us in the Holy Scriptures. An assembly of men, without anything to indicate that they are assembled in the Lord's name, is not a church. An organization that is formed for secular purposes and temporal interests, though all of its members were Christians, and all of its acts were irreproachable, is not a church. To form a congregation that can be recognized as a church, believers must confess their faith in Christ and gather around the word and sacrament as God's means of Church building. And this confession of faith must be the test of membership. The saving faith that is in the soul is not available as a criterion in an external organization. It is not visible, nor can its presence in an individual be infallibly known by any visible sign. If this were possible the whole question of Church fellowship would present itself in a different aspect. According to the Lord's word he who believes is a member of the Church, and all believers recognize that word as decisive. If these had the power to see into each other's hearts all unbelievers would be excluded from the organization, and only believers, who properly constitute the Church, would be recognized as members. But we have no such power and the arrogance and presumption which would claim it and attempt to

exercise it are forbidden us. The application of the rule, that all believers and only believers have the rights and privileges of church membership, is practicable only negatively in the organization and government of the visible church. There are some infallible marks of unbelief. We cannot be mistaken about a person's being an unbeliever when he openly rejects Christ and the Scriptures, or when he boldly claims the right to live in sin and impenitently persists in it, whatever the Lord may say. Of course, known unbelievers cannot without sin be admitted to fellowship in the visible church, because the mind of the Lord is known with regard to them. But there are no such infallible signs of faith. Believers will indeed show their faith by their works; but such fruits can never be unerring signs that the person who bears them is a true believer. He may be a hypocrite, and the inducements to play the hypocrite are many in this world that lieth in wickedness. Our merciful Lord has not required us to know who are believers and who are not. He has not enabled us to look into man's heart, and he, who knows what is in man, does not reveal to us whether a person that solicits membership is a believer or not. Our visible church building is therefore always subject to our human limitations and disabilities. We must decide with whom we can have Christian fellowship in the congregation, but we cannot apply the test which the Lord applies in building the invisible congregation of true believers. Still, he has not left us without guidance in our work. Not every one who professes to be a Christian, and not every one who lives a respectable life, is to be received. That would endanger the very existence of the Church where the structure is made to rest on such a foundation. It is easy for a Unitarian or a Mormon to say that he is a Christian, or for a Jew or Gentile to be respectable in his morals. The rule which the Lord gives embraces more than this. "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," John 8 : 31, 32. "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them," Rom. 16 : 17. "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive

him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his his evil deeds," 2 John 10 : 11. "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you concerning the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," Jude 3. There is not the remotest intimation that any man has a right to sift the sayings of our Lord and the doctrine which we have learned, and make that which seems to him of prime importance, to the exclusion of the rest, the basis and condition of church membership. No doubt one article of the faith is of greater import for the apprehension of the saving truth than another, and of wider application in the Christian life than another; but, aside from the fact that what is of essential significance in the experience of one is not always so in that of another, the Lord has never given to any man or body of men the right to make distinctions in the contents of revelation with a view of dispensing any soul from the obligation of receiving and confessing what may seem of minor importance. That is manifestly the way to undermine the supremacy of the word of the Lord. Not even in regard to life, which is of far less importance than the divine word, on whose power the very existence of the Church depends, can there be such a dispensation from the binding authority of the Scriptures. One who insists on the right to sin has no business in the Church, and no congregation is loyal that concedes such a right. So when believers by the grace of God have a knowledge of truth, they will confess it, and cannot, in violation of their conscience bound by the word of God, consent to abandon it because others have not learned it or do not acknowledge it. They may bear with the weak, who are yet under instruction, but they cannot tolerate a teaching that undermines their faith. Pronouncing a doctrine of Scripture non-fundamental does not render it the less binding, and does not release any one from the obligation to accept it. If divisions are made by those who claim the right to teach a different doctrine, they must bear the responsibility of the sin and of its consequences. The question whether the doctrine in contro-

versy is essential to the existence of faith in the soul is then of moment in determining whether the separated party can still be recognized as a church, but it has no voice in determining what must be regarded as obligatory. The word of the Lord is absolutely authoritative, whether people call the doctrine under consideration essential or non-essential. If one rejects the revealed truth in question and claims the right to teach it, contrary to the faith of the congregation, he cannot be received into fellowship. The question is not primarily whether he is a believer or not. Even if this were possible, so far as the disputed doctrine bears on the point, there are other reasons why we must have no fellowship with error. "He that teaches and lives otherwise than God's word teaches, profanes the name of God among us. From this preserve us, heavenly Father." If we tolerate such doctrine or life in the Church we become responsible for the sin and the injury: "neither be partaker of other men's sins; keep thyself pure," 1 Tim. 5 : 22. If a person may have faith, notwithstanding the error into which he has fallen, that error, if it is permitted in the Church, may prove destructive to thousands, whose faith it may undermine. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," Gal. 5 : 9. "Their word will eat as doeth a canker," 2 Tim. 2 : 17. The Lord allows errors no rights in the Church. His word is our guide. That we can know: whether a man is a believer or not we cannot know. He has given us a rule that is practicable, and by that we should be content to abide. If any, in spite of his revealed will, make divisions because they think a known truth is not fundamental and therefore should not be insisted on, or because they claim for error a right which the Church will not allow, they must answer for it when the Lord shall call us all to account. Whether they are believers or not the Lord will judge.

7. The Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a visible organization of Christians, was based upon the pure gospel which God in the glorious days of the Reformation restored to his people. By his grace large numbers were led to seek salvation in Christ by faith alone. They accepted the Catechism of Luther as a

simple statement of the gospel truth which they believed and therefore proposed to teach their children, and formally declared their evangelical faith before all people in the Augsburg Confession. The adherents of the pope refused to accept or to tolerate the truth which brought comfort and joy to the hearts of these believers, and insisted on the renunciation of the doctrines which they had learned from the Scriptures and submission to the errors of Rome. Of course the division came in the organization of churches as it had come in the faith and confession. There were others who, whilst they refused any longer to sanction the corruptions of the papacy, would not accept the confession which the evangelical party, commonly called Lutherans, presented at Augsburg as the truth of God by which they meant to abide, and published a different confession. The Lutherans, firmly believing that every article of the faith which they confessed must be maintained, on the authority of Holy Scriptures, for the sake of their own souls' peace and of the purity and prosperity of the Church, could not yield. There was thus another division, and Reformed churches were organized in distinction and in separation from both the Lutheran and the Roman. There was sin in this. There should be no divisions among us. They do wrong who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned. Whose was the fault? Rome may see to it how she answers on the judgment day for her refusal to accept the gospel and for her persecution of those who believed it and confessed it. The Reformed may see to it how they answer on that great day for declining to accept some articles of the faith which Lutherans confessed and substituting some opinions which conflict with it, thus causing a division. And the Lutherans—are they a peculiarly favored people that are exempt from the infirmities and from the accountability which belongs to ordinary mortals? Any imputation of such thoughts does a gross wrong to the children of God that are gathered in the Evangelical Lutheran Church. We too must give account on that awful day of reckoning before a judge that knows all and judgeth righteous judgment. Nor have we any such flippant thought as that we will take our chances.

We want no chances, but the full and joyful assurance of faith, in a matter of such unutterable moment. If the Lutheran Church has organized her congregations on the basis of a confession that is not scriptural—has required for church fellowship what God has not required—she has caused divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which the Lord has taught his people, and is to be avoided. In that case she is a sect that has no divine right of existence. But if her confession sets forth the pure truth of the gospel, she is the true visible Church of Christ on earth. She teaches nothing but what God's word teaches, and insists on nothing which the Lord does not require. "Unto the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men, should be alike everywhere." Augsb. Conf. Art. VII. Divisions exist in the visible Church, but not through her fault. Nor does she in her pain at this unhappy fact lose her temper and misjudge the situation, or in uncharitableness condemn the children of God in other denominations. She does not forget that the Church is an article of faith, and that its existence is known by certain marks, which are the use of the means of grace. Where the gospel is still preached and the sacraments are still administered, so that the Holy Ghost can still do his saving work, there is a church, notwithstanding the errors and sins that may have crept in, and notwithstanding the fact that it is, because of the errors in its confession, not a true church, that is, not a pure church. The Lutheran Church has never been guilty of the crying wrong which is done by denominations claiming to be especially liberal and charitable, of treating other churches like heathens and sending missionaries among them, or permitting pastors to pursue proselyting schemes among the members of other churches. She acknowledges all denominations that still have enough of the gospel to bring souls to Christ and salvation to be churches, and respects their rights as churches, scrupulously avoiding all interference with their exercise. But she cannot admit that they are right in their distinctive doctrines which form barriers to the

unity of the Church and prevent external fellowship in word and sacrament.

We are in full accord with those who ardently desire the union of all churches, and, so far as we see any prospect of accomplishing such an end at all, mean this to be a contribution towards it. So far as Lutherans are concerned, no plan of union that ignores doctrinal differences will ever meet with favor. The VII. Article of the Augustana, that agreement concerning the doctrine of the gospel is necessary to church fellowship, is part of their faith. They should not be expected and should not be asked to violate their consciences. God helping them, they will not do it. But they may be expected to love the souls of men as well as the truth that makes these souls free, and therefore to labor earnestly for the removal of all hindrances, so far as may lie in their power, to the successful prosecution of the great work of the Church. They should try to understand one another, be just toward each other, exercise charity in their judgments of one another, and regard the rights of each other as churches. Let there be an ardent love of the truth which God has in mercy revealed for the salvation of our lost race, and a holy zeal to apprehend and appreciate and preserve the blessed gift. Let there be no carnal sentimentalism that fears to wound the sinner's feelings or hopes to win the sinner's favor for worldly ends. Let there be no carnal rationalism that makes light of revealed truth and presumes to dictate to the Lord what portions of his gracious revelation he shall deem it expedient to enforce, and what portions he must, in the present exigency, permit to be set aside. Let us be honest with one another, and have love enough in our souls to tell each other the truth, even if we must suffer for our open-hearted endeavors to help each other. Let us hate sin and love righteousness, whether it be in ourselves or in others, and have the courage to tell others of their sin because we have the humility to repent in dust and ashes of our own. Meantime let us remember for our comfort that the Church proper is not constituted by the external organization, and that there may be Christians and therefore a church whose rights we must respect even under the Romish anti-christ.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CHURCH OLDER THAN THE BIBLE.

BY REV. JOHN TOMLINSON, A. M.

The Bible is the word of God, the utterance of divine wisdom and love, the rule of both faith and practice, the authoritative standard of religion and morality, the only source of Christian truth, exclusive of all human commandments and traditions. The word of God is all-sufficient (Farel). The Bible is the faith of the Church. Luther, therefore, said, in a disputation with Henry the VIII.: If a teaching is opposed to Scripture, whatever be its origin,—whether tradition, custom, Thomasts, Sophists, Satan, or even an angel from heaven—all from whom it proceeds must be accursed; nothing can exist contrary to the Bible. The word of God is above the Church, (Cranmer). In this principle consisted the whole of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It is the opinion of Drs. Walton, Cudworth, Lord C. Witlock, Castell, etc., some of the most learned men of the seventeenth century, that our English Bible is the *best translation* of any in the world. But not to insist on this, the old maxim must certainly be false, namely, That the teachings of the Church must not be examined by Scripture, but that Scripture must be understood by means of what the Church says.

The Church is *the aggregate of all true believers in Christ*. All those, and *only* those who believe in Christ are members of the Church. The Church is the *spiritual body* of Christ, the congregation of the saints, whose hearts, through faith in Christ, are ruled by the Holy Ghost. The Church properly is nothing else than the congregation of saints and *true* believers. Augs. Conf., Art. VIII.

The word of God and the sacraments are necessarily connected with the Church, they being the seed of the Church, (1 Pet. 1 : 23 ; Mark 4 : 26, 27 ; Tit. 3 : 5, 6), and also true marks

of the Church, but they are not the Church itself, nor any part of it.

There are two views held in regard to the Church :

1. The mechanical view. This is the largely dominant view. According to this view of the Church, Christ is a mere builder, a simple mechanic, who conducts his work according to the laws of that art. The Church is a structure which is begun and carried on, from first to last, as the carpenter constructs his house or the machinist his machine. Christ begins the Church outward from himself, and, by virtue of his skill and power, adds timber to timber until the temple is completed. Men are like marble blocks added to it, or walled into it in some secure way. His relation to it is one of outward contact. He touches it, it is true. He handles all its individual parts. He brings them together and adds them, the one to the other; but still as distinct and separate from it as the mechanic is from the brick and timber of the house he constructs. The Church stands over on a creed, begins *to be* in some hard dogma, which is to be the eternal measure of its temperature and capacity. Christ is architect and nothing more, and does not put himself into the Church in any vital and direct way.

2. The spiritual view. This is the opposite of the one already described. According to this view Christ is not put to the drudgery of mere architect, to hew and shape men after certain models and adjust them to logical plans and schemes. In the spiritual and vital view, the Church is not *made* but created. It is not a manufacture but a growth. Growth is the motion of life in its effort to organize external substances. In creation the Creator passes over into the created object, and is forever immanent in it; and so Christ passes over into the Church. He grows up into it. It is *his body*. He is law, and blood and life to it. It begins in him. He is, if we may so speak, its first member, its eternal norm. He does not stand to his Church in the relation of mechanic, but in the relation of germ to blade and ear, seed to stalk, mother to child, and spirit to body. He is foundation, corner-stone and *head* to it. There are no void spaces between him and the Church, over which he must come

to it. It is *himself* in increase. There is no foundation outside, or away from him, of creed, or dogma, or speculation of the intellect, or abstract principle, down upon which he works as carpenter, mason, logician, &c., to have a Church. The Church comes of a germ or seed, and not by a process of building; and the Church is never separated from its germ. Christ is that germ or seed. The kingdom of heaven is as a grain of mustard seed. The Scriptures speak of Christ as an exhaustless, self-subsistent *power of life*. When we get back to Jesus Christ in the Gospel, he is life put in motion from within. He did not recognize synods and conventions, etc. He believed in a *spiritual power* and life, that organized from within outward. The Church in his day believed in a conventional power that organized from without inward. The Church in Christ's day tested men by tradition and creeds. He did it by the tone and purpose of the heart; and yet there never was such great power among men. In the outgoings of the divine influence of his life he passed over into men and converted and renewed them, and organized them into unity and harmony with himself. He was the seed; he was the leaven. Put him where you will, and he finds a passage into souls by the influence of his great life, by his sweetness, love, tenderness and strength. And he increased the Church by doing deeds of love in the souls of men. He organized men by coming up into them with a new power of truth and life. The Church began in Christ and grew into order and organization around him. Organization has not the priority in the Christian Church—priority belongs to faith and life. This is a succinct statement of the two views held in regard to the Christian Church.

The purpose of the writer of this article is to show that THE CHURCH IS NOT OLDER THAN THE BIBLE. The argument is as follows:

1. The sacred Scriptures clearly teach that the word of God is prior to the Church. St. James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." Now, is the Father older than the Son, or *cause* than *effect*. If so, God begat us will with his *own* will, with the word of truth. If he who begetteth is before him

who is begotten, or *cause* is before *effect*, then the *word* is before the Church or congregation. For it is one of the forces that operates in the production of the Church. The word is the instrumentality. There are three forces that operate in the production of the Church, namely, the blood of Christ (the meritorious cause), the Word of God (the instrumental cause), and the Holy Ghost (the efficient cause). Now the Church can not be older than the causes which operate to produce it, unless effects can be older than their causes, which is *unreasonable*. Here then is one plain clear text of Scripture to the point, and one such text is worth more in argument than a Talmud of traditions. There is another text of similar import in 1 Cor. 4:15. In Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the Gospel. Paul claims to be the spiritual father of the Corinthians, in the context. The father, as already stated, is older than the son. He was instrumental in the conversion of the Corinthians, through the preaching of the Gospel. The Gospel was one of the forces that operated in the conversion of the Corinthians, and the gathering and building up of a church at Corinth, and, of course, is older than the Church; and what applies to the Church at Corinth in these respects, applies to the whole Church. Sanctify them through thy *truth*, John 17:17, bears on this point also, with great force. Christ says: Thy word is truth (the word of God), *i. e.* *pure* truth without mixture, *entire* truth, without deficiency. This word is the ordinary means of sanctification, *not* of itself, for then it would always sanctify; but it is the instrument which the Holy Spirit commonly uses in beginning and carrying on this good work. It is the seed of the new birth, 1 Pet. 1:23; and the food of the new life, 1 Pet. 2:1, 2. The seed is older than the plant. The truth is, therefore, prior to the Church. Ephesians 2:20. Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, is applicable also.

Christ is a living stone and the Church a growth on this foundation. *Primarily*, Jesus Christ is the foundation of the Church. The Lord God saith: Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation;

he that believeth shall not make haste. Matt. 16 : 18, is also in point: Upon this rock (Peter's confession), will I build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. *Secondarily*, the Bible is the foundation of the Church, Eph. 2 : 20. Ye are built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, etc., *i.e.* upon what they taught—the Old and New Testaments. Upon this rock (the Bible) will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, is again pertinent. No one can doubt that the Bible is the foundation of the Church. Well might General Jackson go a step farther and say: Upon this rock, pointing to the Bible, "rests our republic." Read and study the word of God, and all doubts as to which has priority, the Church or the Bible, will vanish at once.

2. History contains irrefragable proof that the Bible is older than the Church. The sayings of the prophets existed in the time of Christ, *only* as Scripture. To this written word our Lord appealed again and again when he founded his kingdom. Jesus said to the Sadducees, Matt. 22 : 27: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. It is written, Matt. 26 : 24, 54, "The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him; but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it had been good for that man if he had not been born." But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be. Christ said, Mark 14 : 49, "I was daily with you in the temple, and ye took *me* not, but the Scriptures must be fulfilled." Jesus said to the twelve: "Behold, I go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished," Luke 18 : 31. Jesus, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them (the disciples) in all the Scriptures concerning himself. And he said unto them: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the Psalms of me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures," Luke 24 : 27, 44, 45. "Search the Scriptures," said Jesus, "for in them ye think ye have eternal

life, and they are they which testify of me," John 5 : 39. "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me," John 5 : 46; John 10 : 35. He said the Scriptures can not be broken. And again, John 17 : 12: "None of them is lost save the son of perdition, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled." The histories of our Lord as recorded by the different evangelists, make it very plain and clear that Christ did appeal to the Scriptures extant in his day, to establish his Church, and not *vice versa*, to the Church to establish the Scriptures. When Christ came on the earth, he gave *the word*. When he ascended to heaven, he gave the *Holy Spirit*. These are *the forces* that *must* regenerate it—*effects* cannot be older than their causes. In the time of the Reformers, the teachings of the apostles existed *only* as Scripture. And it was to this *written word* they appealed to re-establish the Church. Luther said that he would rather see all his books burned than that they should separate between any man and the Bible.

Zwingli said to some who proposed to believe in the *new doctors*: "Believe not in us, but in God's word." The Reformers appeal constantly to the sacred writings. It is a fact attested in the whole history of the Church, that when she has lost the life peculiar to her, she must again put herself in communication with her creative principle, the word of God (oral, written or printed revelation). Just as the buckets of a wheel, employed in irrigating the meadows, have no sooner discharged their reviving waters, than they dip again into the stream to be refilled, so every generation void of the Spirit of Christ, must return to the *Divine Source* to be again filled up. These primitive words which created the Church have been preserved for us in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles of the New Testament; and the humble reading of these divine writings will create in every age the communion of saints. Why this continuous appeal to the word of God, if it have not priority? If it be not *older* than the Church?

3. Paul teaches that the Bible is prior to the Church by analogy. It is well often to use a comparison. Hence the apostle compares the Church to a building, Eph. 2 : 20—a growing building, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in

whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. Peter compares the Church to a house built of lively stones, founded upon a living foundation (Christ), having eternal life in himself. But certainly a house cannot be older than its foundation. The Bible in a *secondary* sense is the foundation of this spiritual house. Jesus Christ is the essential word and the Bible is the written word, and both are older than the Church.

4. From the nature of things, the Church can not be older than the Bible. The Church consists of all those who worship God according to the doctrine of Christ. The doctrine of Christ is the rule of worship in the Church. The Church *can not* be older than her *rule* of worship.

To sum up now, allow the use of a parallelism. The parallels intended are, of course, the Bible and the Church. Follow these lines back to the Reformation, and it will be found that the Reformers appealed loudly to the word of God to restore a fallen Church; proceed along these lines to the apostles, to Pentecost, etc., and it will be found that the Bible was there before the Church. Peter, it is true, preached without a *printed* Bible in his hands, but Peter and the rest of the apostles were a *living* Scripture. Going along these same lines back to Abraham and Adam, and everywhere the Bible will be discovered *first*. The Church *never* is first—it *can not* be first; for the Church grows out of the Bible. It is a *fact*, too, that all the advocates of the opposite view appeal to the Sacred Scriptures to establish their assertions. They should not, for consistency's sake, take their texts from the Bible to support their theory. They ought to use for a text book the Church and not the Bible.

Some one will, perhaps, say, that those who canonized the sacred Scriptures, were elevated above them. Who collected the books of the Bible into one volume? Answer: The canon of the Old Testament dates back to Ezra, B. C. 457. The greater part of the books of the New Testament were collected before the middle of the second century, and finally completed at Hippo, A. D. 393. The men, rulers, &c., of the Church, who did this work of canonization, used all possible diligence and

care in separating the *genuine* from the *spurious* writings, and conveying them down to posterity in one volume. Are they on this account, however, to be exalted above the Scriptures themselves? Certainly not. They only collected the scattered Scriptures into one volume, that the people might know what is Scripture. The following illustration will be in point just here, namely: A man is appointed, or a set of men, to collect scattered laws, one here and another there, into one volume, so that the people may know the law. *How* does this canonizing of the law raise him or them above the law? It does not do it—neither did the collecting of the Scriptures into one book, exalt those who did it above those Scriptures themselves. With all due deference to those who emphasize an ecclesiasticism and the sacrificial system, the Church is not older than the Bible. Neither the Church, nor her confessions, nor theologians, can be put in place of Holy Scripture. This declaration recognizes the sovereign authority of the Holy Scriptures. Well might the Reformers teach that the Scriptures were the only *principium cognoscendi*. From these we must get our knowledge of theology. All human teachings must be subordinate to the oracles of God. The Bible can never err. The Church cannot save us, but if we believe in the doctrine of justification by faith without works, no power on earth or in hell can prevent our salvation.

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HUNT AND EATON, 150 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Was the Apostle Peter ever at Rome? By Rev. Mason Gallagher, D. D. Introduction by Rev. John Hall, D. D. 1894. pp. xiv and 246. \$1.00.

This is a really learned book. The author has investigated every available source of information. The tone is calm and impartial. The impression made by reading the book is that Peter was never at Rome, and hence that he is not the founder of the Roman Catholic Church. In the New Testament there is not a word that indicates that Peter ever

left the East. He was the apostle to the circumcision, and doubtless ended his days in Babylon on the Euphrates, where according to Josephus the Jews in Peter's time were "infinite myriads, whose number it is not possible to calculate," or, as Philo says, constituted "almost one half the inhabitants." All efforts to show that "Babylon" in 1 Pet. 5:13 means Rome are unsatisfactory. Had Peter written his first Epistle from the world's capital he would certainly have given some clue to his whereabouts, and would not have concealed it. Paul who lived for a considerable time at Rome, and died there, makes no allusion to Peter's residence in the eternal city. This is inexplicable on any other supposition than that Peter was not at Rome.

The claim of the Petrine residence rests simply on tradition, which received endorsement by Eusebius and Jerome. But by that time the Roman bishop had found it convenient to support his claim to primacy by appeal to Peter as the chief of the apostles and who had established the *Cathedra Patri* as the earthly throne of the Church.

But this tradition lacks support at the very point where support ought to be found. Says our author: "It has been shown that in the first century, in the writings of the only two authors whose works have reached us, Clement and Ignatius, nothing whatever is said concerning Peter's presence in Rome. Evidence is presented that in the five authentic documents of the century following Peter's death, which exist—the works of Polycarp, Barnabas, Hermas, Justin, and the Didache—there is no statement to be found that Peter visited Rome, or died there." p. 243.

Many of the greatest Roman Catholic scholars, nearly all great Protestant scholars, learned archaeologists, and distinguished jurists, "investigating the subject critically, have given this unanimous verdict: the case not proven with respect to Peter's visit to Rome; no reliable evidence whatever on the part of the affirmative." p. 244.

The final conclusion is that the claims of the Church of Rome do not rest on a solid foundation—"certainly not sufficient to lead us to trust in a religion which depends for its authority over mankind on the presumption that Peter was in Rome, was Bishop of Rome, and has handed down to the occupants of the See supreme power over all bishops, ministers, and members of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ," p. 245. We believe that the facts and the arguments of the book fully sustain such a conclusion.

The book will furnish a good antidote to the growing influence of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. It strikes the tap-root.

J. W. R.

Anti-Higher Criticism, or Testimony to the Infallibility of the Bible.

By Professor Howard Osgood, D. D., LL. D.; Professor William G. Moorehead, D. D.; Talbot W. Chambers, D. D., LL. D.; James H. Brooks, D. D.; George S. Bishop, D. D.; B. B. Tyler, D. D.; Pro-

fessor Ernst F. Stroeter, Ph. D.; Professor James M. Stifler, D. D.; William Dinwiddie, D. D. Edited and compiled by Rev. L. W. Munhall, M. A. 1894. pp. 354. \$1.50.

"The addresses composing this volume were delivered before the Sixth Annual Interdenominational Seaside Bible Conference, in Educational Hall, Asbury Park, N. J., August 11-21, 1893."

The standpoint of this book is that of thorough-going opposition to the Higher Criticism. It makes scarcely a concession. Its style is popular rather than scholarly. Hence its treatment of the various subjects in hand will hardly satisfy the honest convictions of scholars. Dr. Green's addresses entitled, "The Unity of the Pentateuch," and, "Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch" are of exceptional merit.

Prof. Stroeter has handled well "The Gospels," and Prof. Stifler gives a capital comment on "The Council in Jerusalem—(Acts xv.)"

All the other addresses are readable, but none of them are profound. They are intended for the people and deserve to be widely read. They will steady and strengthen faith in this time of wavering and doubt. The one unifying thought of these addresses is that of defense of the Bible as we have known it from our childhood. The positions of opponents are fairly stated, and reasons for not accepting the conclusions of the Higher Criticism are given with clearness and force. The book will be serviceable to pastors who wish to have in brief compass the chief points of Higher Criticism and of Anti-Higher Criticism. J. W. R.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, NEW YORK, CHICAGO.

Foreign Missions after a Century. By Rev. James S. Dennis, D.D., of the American Presbyterian Mission, Beirut, Syria. Second Edition. pp. 368. \$1.50.

In the Spring of 1893 Dr. Dennis delivered six lectures before the faculty and students of Princeton Theological Seminary on Missions. These lectures elaborated constitute the book before us, which has quickly passed into the second edition. The author is *en rapport* with his theme, and his knowledge of the subject is almost encyclopaedic. The very latest facts are given, and the needs and opportunities are graphically described. The facts of success given by the author are themselves the most eloquent plea for the more vigorous prosecution of Foreign Missionary work. The needs of the foreign field can be measured only by the extent and influence of heathendom, which is still more than two-thirds of the human race. The opportunities are commensurate with the whole of the unevangelized peoples of the earth, for every land is now accessible to the Gospel.

We know of no work on the subject of Foreign Missions, except Christlieb's, now quite out of date as to its facts, which is calculated to do so much good as this one. The missionary worker and the pastor can hardly afford to be without it.

J. W. R.

How to Read the Prophets. Being the Prophecies arranged Chronologically in their Historical Setting with Explanations and Glossary. By the Rev. Buchanan Blake, B. D. Part IV. Ezekiel. pp. 238. \$1.50. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

This is the fourth volume of a series which seems to have attracted considerable attention in England and Scotland. The chief aim of the author is to facilitate the understanding of the prophetic writings by chronological arrangement. The full text is given without the usual divisions of chapters and verses, but with divisions and headings as called for by the nature of the subject-matter. In general these divisions and headings are happily made, and serve as a kind of commentary on the text. In date the prophecies of Ezekiel, to which this book is confined, extend from 592 to 572 B. C. Israel was now in captivity as the result of sin. The prophet had to urge a due appreciation of the situation. He denounced the spiritual infidelity of the people, but also told of a bright future. The author helps us to perceive the particular thought by his headings. But the most valuable part of the author's work is found on pages 144-226, in which *inter alia* we have an historical account of the period embraced in the prophecies. In eleven chapters he discusses "The Consecration of the Prophet, and his Vision," "Ezekiel's First Ministry by Symbolic Action and Solemn Word," "The State of Jerusalem 591 B. C.," "Allegories and Illustrations of Judgment," "Zedekiah's Conduct Condemned," "A Retrospect of the Divine Dealings with Israel and a Great Indictment," "Prophecies on the Eve of Jerusalem's Fall against the Nations," "The New Future: Crisis Past and Restoration Begun," "Three Great Doctrines Illustrated: Revival—Reunion—Conquest," "The Lost Vision and the Prophet. The New Temple and the Order of Religious Worship," "The Settlement of the Land. Regulations for Prince and People."

There is also an interesting chapter on "The Religious Conceptions of Ezekiel." God is the Eternal, the Almighty One, the absolutely Holy, who does not confine his presence to any one people, but is supreme over all nations. Israel can secure the favor of God only through regeneration, and only in this way can he carry on the missionary propaganda which is to bring the name of God before the peoples of the earth.

A "Glossary of Names and Notes" followed by an Index closes the book, a prominent characteristic of which is reverence for the word of God. There is no sifting and no criticising, and no intimation that the author has been disturbed by the Higher Criticism. J. W. R.

The Resurrection of the Dead. An Exposition of 1 Corinthians xv. By the late William Milligan, D. D. Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. 1894. pp. 246. \$1.75. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

The author of this book was a very distinguished biblical scholar.

He was a member of the New Testament company of Revisers, and a contributor to "Commentary on the New Testament" published some years ago under the editorial supervision of Dr. Schaff. His other contributions to theological science are important and valuable. But this his last book, the fruit of life-long study of the New Testament, is as apples of gold in pictures of silver. Exegesis, logic, faith and Scotch common sense are here found at their best. There is no speculating, no philosophising about the resurrection of the dead, but a simple clear exposition of what the apostle teaches in chapter xv of 1 Corinthians. The argument proceeds in this way: Christ died and rose from the dead. This the Corinthians acknowledged. He is therefore the first fruits of the Resurrection. We also shall die, but being in Christ, that is, being voluntarily associated with him, being spiritually united to him as "the Christ," we also shall rise from the dead. Christ's resurrection was personal, individual. Our Resurrection shall be personal, individual. In Adam all die. In Christ all shall be made alive. The "all" in the second clause cannot be universal, but must be restricted to all who are in Christ, as Paul is not here speaking of a universal resurrection but of the resurrection of Christians. "It is a resurrection in Christ, with Christ, and to Christ—the Lord of Glory. It is the necessary condition of eternal life, and St. Paul's thoughts are mainly occupied, not with the condition, but with the life which presupposes it. That life is led in a risen Saviour. Through him it is with God and in God, a holy, blessed, active life in communion and fellowship with him who is the foundation of all existence and the dispenser of all happiness." p. 102.

The difficult passage, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body," is briefly, but most happily expounded. "Body" is an organism. The $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ is not the $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$. There is no necessary relation between the two. The power of $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ may be destroyed, while $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ still remains body. Consequently $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ may be "holy" which the $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ can never be. There is no necessary contrariety between what is bodily and what is spiritual. "The word 'body' only says that there shall be an investiture or framework within which the vital force shall dwell, and by which each possessor of a body shall be separated from his fellows." "Natural" ($\psi\nu\chi\nu\acute{o}\acute{s}$) is ambiguous. The adjective must be understood from $\psi\nu\chi\nu\acute{y}$, which is that in man which adapts him to this world of sense in which for the present time he moves. The word $\psi\nu\chi\nu\acute{o}\acute{s}$ is neither "natural" nor "sensual" nor "animal," "but ruled by the senses, or by the material things around us as they are apprehended by the senses; and the English adjective which appears to come nearest to the expression of this thought is 'sensuous.' " Hence "it is sown a sensuous body."

The spiritual body stands in contrast with the sensuous body. It is that part of man which brings him into contact with God. This spirit-

ual body shall be adapted to the condition and requirements of the soul in its loftiest flights. We have an example of both kinds of body in Christ. While tabernacling among men he had a sensuous body, subject to all the accidents of such a body,—hunger, thirst, weariness, agony, sorrow. After the resurrection all these things were changed. His body was completely subservient to the spirit—a spiritual body.

The Resurrection also illustrates the law of progress towards a higher destiny. First the natural then the spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthly. The second man is from heaven. Union with the first brings death. Union with the second brings resurrection from the dead.

The last chapter (XII) is based on verses 53-58. The Resurrection is viewed as a completed victory over death. Then comes the shout of triumph.

Such is a brief outline of a book which in matter and in manner is almost above adverse criticism except by those who are determined not to believe in the Resurrection. Every paragraph is weighty with thought. The language is easy; the style is perspicuous. It is not above the capacity of laymen, and will well serve the theologian who studies exegesis, and the minister who is in search of material for his sermons. The faith which the book exhibits shows that the author has no doubt on the doctrine of the Resurrection, or about Paul's inspiration in teaching it.

J. W. R.

The Supernatural in Christianity with Special Reference to Statements in the Recent Gifford Lectures by Principal Rainy, D. D., Professor J. Orr, D. D., and Professor Marcus Dods, D. D. With Prefatory Statement by Professor A. H. Charteris, D. D. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1894. pp. 111. 8oc.

The Gifford lectures were delivered before the University of Edinburgh this year by Professor Dr. Otto Pfleiderer of Berlin, who is generally recognized as without a living superior as a philosophical theologian. In the lectures in question Dr. Pfleiderer, proceeding along the way of the Tübingen school, has sought to eliminate the supernatural element from Christianity, and to account for all its phenomena purely on grounds of natural development. Jesus Christ was only a man; he wrought no miracles, and there was no resurrection. The Gospel of John was written about the year 140 A. D., or later, and is a didactic treatise, and not an historical narrative.

The promulgation of such views in Edinburg under the aegis of its great University naturally excited opposition, the result of which is the book before us, which, besides "the Prefatory statement" by Professor Charteris, contains a lecture by each of the other well-known scholars mentioned on the title-page. The first discusses "The Issues at Stake," and seeks to show their destructive bearing on Christianity.

Dr. Pfeiderer is simply an advocate of Natural Religion, and a reproducer, with modifications, of Lessing's tract on "The Education of the Human Race." Issue is joined at this point. Christianity has always claimed to be a supernatural religion. The supernatural appears pre-eminently in the person and work of Christ. He is the Revealer of God, and it is not contrary to the personality and fatherhood of God, both of which are admitted by Dr. Pfeiderer, to conclude that he should interpose by miracle and by grace to save men from sin and misery.

The second lecturer proceeds to answer the question: "Can Professor Pfeiderer's View Justify Itself?" He thinks it breaks down under its own admissions. Pfeiderer admits that God "is a Personality, full of love, fatherhood and the desire of self-communication." Yet he denies that God ever imparts himself except through nature. The denial is inconsistent with the character ascribed to God. "Some direct, immediate, articulate word of God to man is the most natural and probable thing imaginable."

The third lecturer deals with the facts in evidence for the genuineness and trustworthiness of the gospel history. Internal characteristics and external facts combine to show that the four Gospels and the Acts are unimpeachable records of events. The miracles of the New Testament are not against nature, but only the removal of obstructions against the manifestation of God's goodwill towards men.

Taken as a whole the book is popular rather than profound. Yet it furnishes ample reasons for believing that Christianity is a supernatural religion, and that the history of its origin given in the Gospels is its only sufficient explanation.

J. W. R.

THOMAS WHITTAKER 2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

The Theology of the New Testament. By Walter F. Adeney, M. A. Professor of New Testament Introduction, History, and Exegesis, New College, London. 1894. pp. 248. 75c.

This book belongs to the "Theological Educator" series, which has been favorably received, so far as published, both in Great Britain and in America. The series aims to present in brief and condensed form, and from the conservative standpoint, the best results of study and scholarship in the various departments of theological science.

The volume before us is devoted to a subject which has long had a prominent place in Germany, but which until recently has been almost entirely neglected among the English-speaking peoples. In our theological seminaries, systematic, historical and practical theology has claimed the almost exclusive time and attention of the student. The time is at hand when biblical theology will be coördinated with other leading branches of theological science. We hail this little book as a helper towards the desired end. The theology of the New Testament as presented by Prof. Adeney is specially instructive. The author gives us the result of careful original study of the materials. He is not a

compiler. Thoroughly familiar with the best and most recent German works on the subject, he has preserved an independent spirit and a positive, non-speculative method. The book is thoroughly didactic, and only incidentally and mildly polemical. Historical and literary criticism is happily blended with exact exegesis.

After an introduction of sixteen pages on biblical theology in general, and New Testament theology in particular, and on the theology and place of John the Baptist, the author discusses the "Teaching of Jesus Christ," pp. 17-109, under the heads of "The Kingdom of God," which is the state in which God rules, and which is designed to cover the earth; "The Person of Christ," He is "the Messiah," "the Son of Man," "the only begotten Son," in whom alone we have salvation; "the Revelation of God," which centres in the wonderful revelation of the divine Fatherhood: "The Gospel" which is the good news of the approaching account of the Kingdom; "Redemption," which is a divine love; "The Conditions of Membership in the Kingdom," among which the chief are absolute self-renunciation and the new birth; "The New Ethics;" "By far the greater part of the teachings of Jesus Christ recorded in the Gospels was devoted to the practical guidance of his disciples in the conduct of life along the path that he was also indicating by his own example. He took no interest in the elaboration of dogma or the performance of ritual. The strength is mind and soul. His pregnant thought and regal will, all the passion of his enthusiasm and all the fire of his indignation were expended on the behaviour of man and woman towards God and their neighbor. Nevertheless, when torn out of their place in the circle of his instruction, the pure ethics of the Gospel may seem to consist of quite unobtainable, though most beautiful counsel of perfection. It is only while they are taken in their right bearings as laws of the kingdom of God that they can be accepted as immediately practicable," p. 84; "The Future," in which the leading thought is "that Jesus Christ will return for judgment and rule."

It will be observed that the teaching of Christ proceeds from the central thought of the kingdom of God, which involves the idea of righteous, beneficent and world-wide dominion. It is worthy of note that, as reported by the gospels, Christ employs the word "church" only twice, but speaks of the "kingdom" scores of times. The latter is the more comprehensive and inspiring designation. It strengthens the idea of fellowship, as over against the institutional conception of Christianity, which has not a little operated against the coming of the kingdom.

Pages 110-248 are devoted to "The Theology of the Apostles." Under the sub-head of "The Primitive Type" the author expounds:

"I. The Early Preaching;" "II. The Epistle of St. James;" "III. The Later Petrine Theology." The central theme of the early preaching is the Messiahship of Jesus Christ. St. James regards Christianity

from the standpoint of a perfected law. This doctrine of justification is that of the justification of the righteous man. The Petrine Theology contemplates Christianity as the fulfillment of O. T. prophecy.

"The Pauline Type." "St. Paul is the great theologian of the New Testament. His inspired ideas have shaped the thought of Christendom." Paul's theology is largely that of personal experience. He proceeds from the knowledge of sin. In Adam all die. "The exact idea is that death passed to the race as a fatal consequence of the sin of Adam —*i. e.*, the primary thought is not hereditary sin, but hereditary fruits of sin." But the doctrine which especially distinguishes Paul is that of the Second Adam, and personal union with him. Only secondarily and polemically does he treat the doctrine of justification. But with him justification is the declaring righteous of the sinner before God. Salvation is a free gift. It is all of grace based on the pure kindness of God. "The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," and "The Johannine Type" close the book.

The former shows Christianity under the form of a covenant which supersedes the covenant made with Moses. The theology of John, though deeply mystical in the Apocalypse, is emphatically Christo-centric in his gospel and epistles.

Without assenting to every statement and phase of teaching in this book, we do most heartily commend it to ministers and theological students, as sound in doctrine, suggestive in thought and clear in style. A careful study of its pages by ministers will yield rich fruit in the pulpit.

J. W. R.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

The Gospel of St. Mark. By Alexander Maclaren, D. D. pp. 247.

The Gospel of St. Luke. By Alexander Maclaren, D. D. pp. 337.

The Gospel of St. John. By Alexander Maclaren, D. D. pp. 231.

These three volumes belong to the series of "Bible Class Expositions" from the pen of Dr. Maclaren. They are reprinted from the *Sunday School Times*, in which they first appeared. All we said in praise of these expositions, in noticing the volumes on Matthew, can with equal justice be said of these. Within their own scope they are unsurpassed, and the Sunday-school teacher will find nothing more helpful. Dr. Maclaren is not only an excellent expositor but has also a most happy and pointed way of putting things.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. By Handley G. C. Maule, M. A., Principal of Ridley College, Cambridge. pp. 437.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. By James Denney, B. D. pp. 387.

These two additions to "The Expositor's Bible" series are excellent. We are disposed to give a special commendation to the first without, in the least, disparaging the second. No apology is needed for the trans-

lation of the scripture text, which the author characterizes as "rough and formless." It may be so, but it gives force and clearness in most cases, and these are two points which make full compensation for "a rough" piece of rendering. It is a pleasure to add these to what we already have of this series.

O. N. NELSON, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

History of the Scandinavians and Successful Scandinavians in the United States. Compiled and edited by O. N. Nelson. Vol. I. Parts I. and II. pp. 643. Sold only by subscription.

More and more are the people of the United States realizing that the Scandinavian portion of our population is one of the best elements we have among us. Thrifty and law-abiding, these people are rapidly advancing in wealth and influence, and their leaders are gaining an enviable prominence among us. They are industrious, foster schools and religion, and are becoming no small factor in the political world. The reader will not advance far in the book under notice without discovering the vigor of character and the secret of the excellence of these people. The book is well illustrated with portraits of prominent men and many of their educational institutions. It is full of interest and deserves to be widely read.

We are gratified to learn that the author is now making investigations as to the Scandinavians in Iowa, and expects to have a second volume ready in a year or two. This will probably include Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and some Southern States. He is indefatigable in his investigations, and will no doubt give another installment of rare value.

Lutheran readers will find special gratification in this record of the Scandinavians. Many complaints are heard these days about different classes of our immigrants, but not about the Lutheran Germans and Scandinavians. For them there is nothing but commendation and words of welcome. Is not the character of their religious faith and training the conspicuous and controlling element in their excellent citizenship? Let our gates ever swing wide open for them.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Seven Thousand Words often Mispronounced. A Complete Hand-book of Difficulties in English Pronunciation. By William Henry P. Phyne, Third Edition [twenty-fourth thousand] carefully Revised with a Supplement of 1400 Additional Words. pp. 574.

The importance of a correct pronunciation should not be belittled. It is not only the proper thing in itself, but is quite a good indication of a man's education and culture. Pity it is that good usage varies so much, in the case of many words, that reputable dictionaries show a wide difference, and we are often at a loss to know which one to follow. It strikes us that it would be well to have a book like Mr. Phyne's as an arbiter in such cases. It surely would contribute much to greater uni-

formity—a very desirable end. An excellent feature of this book is the correct pronunciation of so many proper names and of words and phrases from foreign languages.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Five Minute Object Sermons to Children. Preached before the Main Sermon of Sunday Morning. Through Eye-gate and Ear-gate into the City of Child-soul. By Sylvanus Stall, D. D. pp. 253.

The gift of talking sense to children in a way to interest them is a rare one. These forty-three short sermons show that Dr. Stall has this rare gift in an eminent degree. This is shown not only in his way of putting things but also in his subjects and illustrative objects. Children should have the Gospel preached to them, and much of it should be done from the pulpit, but how seldom is anything addressed directly to them. The stimulus and suggestions to be derived from this book will prove helpful in supplying this defect. It is a short-coming that surely ought to be met, for the Sunday-school, however good it may be, should not be depended on for all public religious instruction, and the pulpit should face the responsibility resting upon it. These sermons were actually preached by the author, while a pastor in Baltimore, and with most gratifying results. The statements, in some instances, are not scientifically correct and the proof-reading (as on pages 107 and 108) is a little defective, but these faults are quite pardonable in a work otherwise so excellent.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON.

A Bird Lover in the West. By Oliver Thorne Miller.

The writer of this delightful series of papers is an ornithologist whose heart and soul are in her work. Judging from the tone of what she writes we should say that her most congenial employment is listening to and observing the habits of birds and, as we find how much that is of interest she discovers in them, we "blush that we so little see." The studies which led to the writing of the volume were made in Colorado, Utah and Southern Ohio and west relatively to New England and New York. In addition to the valuable information concerning birds which this book contains there is much concerning the country in which the writer spent those charming months. And her style is what has given the polish and graceful finish to every page, for there is not one that does not contain a bit of humor or pathos or of intense appreciation for what is beautiful or grand in nature. It is *the* book for the Summer traveler to take with him, for when the air is hot and sultry he will find its pages so breezy and he will be so well refreshed by reading them that he will forget the discomforts of a high temperature.

On the Road Home. By Margaret E. Sangster.

Mrs. Sangster has become such a frequent contributor to the periodicals of the day and her poems so often grace their columns that every reader who admires noble thought and sentiment has become her fast friend. The poems in this collection have been gathered from the *Congregationalist*, *Intelligencer*, *Sunday School Times*, *Harper's Weekly* and other journals, and they are all of a high grade. The one which the writer has named "His First Love" is a gem and will touch every true heart.

A Roadside Harp. By Louise Imogen Guiney.

The arrangement of these verses is rather unusual as the subjects or titles of them, instead of being at the top, are placed, like notes, along the margin giving the page a decidedly artistic appearance, which, indeed, the covers and all else belonging to the book have. The poems are quite becomingly dressed for they, too, bear the imprint of the artist's touch, and are very beautiful. The writer's meaning does not always lie on the surface, but is the more precious when found.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Benjamin Griffith: Biographical Sketches Contributed by Friends.

Edited by Charles H. Banes, A. M. pp. 296.

The Baptists in the United States can well take pride in their flourishing publication house in Philadelphia, and their esteem for Dr. Griffith ought to be commensurate with this pride. It was Dr. Griffith's foresight and organizing capacity that made the publishing house possible, and it was his efficient management of it that made it such a great power in the Baptist Church. The story of his life as given here is an inspiration. It is another instance of a poor country boy (early an orphan at that), struggling through privations and discouragements to a position of influence and leadership. His loyalty to his Church and his zeal in disseminating its literature may be taken by some as indicative of narrowness, but we do not so regard it. It is only an intense loyalty that leads to an earnest zeal, and, if a denomination has a right to exist, it ought to have the love and zeal of its members. How much Dr. Griffith did for the advancement of the Baptist Church in this country cannot well be measured, and the tributes of praise in this volume are doubtless well deserved.

The History of the English Bible. By T. Harwood Pattison, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Rochester Theological Seminary.

The title may not raise any expectations of interest, but the reader will not advance far into these pages without feeling that they have a surprising charm. From the chapter on "Early Manuscripts" through those on the different versions from the Wycliffe to the Revised there is an interest not simply well sustained but even fascinating. The last

three chapters are on "The Bible in English Literature," "The Bible and the Nation," and "The Bible in Spiritual life." The whole volume will increase the reader's love for the inspired word. We heartily commend it.

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS.

The Atlantic Monthly for July opens with an installment of "Philip and his Wife" that will interest the many readers who have been anxiously waiting for it. Among the many readable articles in this number are Letters of Sidney Lanier, The City on the Housetops, The Home of Glooscap, Lucretius, On the Beach at Daytona, The Mayor and the City, Coleridge's Introduction to the Lake District, In the Dozy Hours, Monetary Reform in Santo Domingo, Baroness Tautphoeus and Modest Excellence. It is a number of unusual value.

The July *Harper's Monthly* is replete with good things. It might be enough to say of it that Charles Dudley Warner begins in this number a new serial, "The Golden House"; but there are also delightful papers on the Harvard and Yale Boat Race, The President at Home, The Storage Battery of the Air, an installment of Mr. Howells' My First Visit to New England, The U. S. Naval Gun Factory, a number of choice stories, and unusually fine illustrations.

The *Century* continues to hold its enviable place among the leading magazines of the world. It is under a management that seems to spare no expense or effort in gratifying the tastes of its excellent class of readers. Its recent issues maintain its high standard and the July number that has just appeared is not a whit behind any of them.

St. Nicholas for July bears on its cover the words "A Great American Number," and such it truly is. Into its stories are woven incidents in the life of Lincoln, Decatur and Sommers, while there are contributions devoted to the Bears of North America, The Brownies through the Union, The Last of the 'Kearsarge,' 'Charles Carroll of Carrollton,' Rhymes of the States, and The Studle Funks' Bon-Fire—a Fourth of July story. When to this list are added stories, verses, puzzles, letters and illustrations, older heads may well envy the youth of to-day.

The *Popular Science Monthly* has done much to awaken and maintain an interest in science. For more than a score of years it has filled an important place in scientific literature, maintaining a high rank among the less technical journals of its class. Its speculative and philosophical trend has not been altogether according to our views, but we enjoy it none the less on that account. It has a place to fill and it fills it well. It is a credit to our American scientific literature.

WANTED.—The editor of the QUARTERLY will be glad to get Nos. 29 and 44 of the *Evangelical Review* and Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 85 of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. He will give good prices for them. Address P. M. Biklé, Gettysburg, Pa.